51st Legislative Day

April 28, 1993

- Speaker Currie: "The House will come to order and Members will be in their seats. The Chaplain for today is the Reverend Don Eloe of the First Baptist Church in Shelbyville, Illinois. Reverend Eloe is the guest of Representative Noland. The guests in the gallery may wish to rise for the invocation. Reverend Eloe."
- Reverend Eloe: "Let's unite our hearts in prayer. Father, we come into Your presence on this new day and, Father, we acknowledge You as our God, and we acknowledge You as our Creator; Father, we acknowledge You as the sustainer of life, and so we give You thanks for life, thanks for strength, thanks for health. Thank You for Your mercies and Your grace that are so abundant and Father, now we pray for wisdom and we pray that You would guide and direct these men and women today, give them the wisdom from above. Father God, invoke Your blessing upon our country, invoke Your blessing upon our state, and we ask this in the name of Jesus. Amen."
- Speaker Currie: "We'll be led in the Pledge of Allegiance by Representative Stroger."
- Stroger et al: "I pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all."
- Speaker Currie: "Roll Call for Attendance. Representative Turner, are there any absences today?"
- Turner: "Yes, thank you, Madam Speaker. On our side of the aisle, Representative LeFlore is excused due to illness."
- Speaker Currie: "Representative Kubik."
- Kubik: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Let the record reflect that Representative Bernie Pedersen and Representative Kay Wojcik are excused today."

51st Legislative Day

April 28, 1993

Speaker Currie: "Start down the Calendar on Third Reading Orders. Clerk, take the record. One hundred and fifteen answering the roll call, a quorum is present. Let's move down the Calendar on special Orders, Third Readings. The first Order, Civil Justice, Third Reading, House Bill 365, Representative Homer. Out of the record. Representative Pugh, House Bill 513. Out of on the record. on House Bill 743. Representative Dunn, Out of the record. Representative Santiago, on House Bill 1277. of the record. Representative Homer, House Bill 1660. of the record. Representative Homer, 1691? Out of the record. Representative Dart, House Bill 2422. Out of the record. Constitutional Officers, Third Reading, Representative Homer, House Bill 1052. Out of the record. Protection, Third Consumer Reading, Representative Schakowsky, House Bill 1505. Out of the record. Education, Third Reading, Representative Dunn, House 1195. Out of the record. Representative Levin, House Bill Levin? Out of Representative the record. Representative Flowers, House Bill 2249. Representative the record. Representative Brunsvold, Flowers? Out of House Bill 2274. Out of the record. Elections and State Government, Third Reading, Representative Deering, House Bill 1562. Representative Deering? Out of the record. and Energy, Third Reading, Representative McGuire, House Bill 350. Representative McGuire? the record. Health Care and Human Services, Third Reading, Representative Phelos, Wouse Bill 552. Representative Phelps? Out of the record. Representative Edley, House 942, Representative Edley? Out of the Representative Curran, House Bill 971, Representative Curran? Out of the record. Representative Ryder, 1390.

51st Legislative Day

April 28, 1993

Out of the record. Housing and Economic Development, Third Representative Turner. House Representative Turner? Out of the record. Insurance, Third Reading, Representative Hicks, House Bill 1067. of the record, and 1829. Labor, Third Reading, House Bill Out of the record. Representative Davis, 925. Representative Blagojevich, House Bill of the record. 1747. Out the record. Law, οf Third Reading, Representative Laurino, House Bill 2357. Representative Laurino? Out of the record. Then we go back to Education, Special Call, Third Reading, Representative Levin, on the Education Call, Third Reading, House Bill 2107. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 2107, a Bill for an Act amending the School Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Currie: "Representative Levin."

Levin: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of House. Amendment #3, which was adopted yesterday, becomes the Bill. If you recall, Amendment #3 corrected the problems that had existed with the underlying Bill. This is the Bill that guarantees that local schools may raise money in Chicago or receive grants. It seemed to me pretty silly to require all grants and fund-raising moneys to go through Pershing Road and then come back. school wants to hold an auction or a bake sale, they should be able to keep the money. They shouldn't have to send it to Pershing Road. If Illinois Bell wants to make a contribution, a grant, to a particular school, they should be able to do that, and this legislation quarantees that. It also provides increased control with respect to the internal accounts in the school on the part of the local school councils. There, unfortunately, has been a problem

51st Legislative Day

April 28, 1993

with embezzlement. This helps to clear up that problem. It resolves the concerns that had been previously expressed with respect to the legislation. It resolves the concerns that Lynn Dominkas from the Mayor's Office had had earlier, resolves the problem that the State Board of Education had, it resolves the problems that the PTA had with this legislation, and I'll be happy to answer any questions, otherwise, I would simply ask for your support for House Bill 2107."

Speaker Currie: "Representative Levin moves 'do pass' on House
Bill 2107; and, on that, for discussion, Representative
Black."

Black: "Yes, thank you very much, Madam Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield for a question?"

Speaker Currie: "He will."

Black: "What kind of fund raising activities are we sanctioning in the Chicago schools? Can they sell magazine subscriptions or greeting cards or go door to door; how they gonna raise this money?"

Levin: "Madam Speaker, can we temporarily pull this Bill out of the record?"

Speaker Currie: "Out of the record. Continuing on Third Readings, Special Orders, on the Order of Local Government, Third Reading, House Bill 1279, Representative Santiago. Out of the record. Representative Santiago, 1280, 1282. Out of the record. Representative Saltsman, House Bill 1508. Out of the record. Representative Dart, 2003. Out of the record. Representative Erwin, House Bill 2240. Out of the record. Third Readings, Professional Regulations. Representative Lou Jones, House Bill 214, House Bill 215. Out of the record. House Bill 324, who is carrying this Bill for Representative LeFlore? House Bill 324. Out of

51st Legislative Day

April 28, 1993

the record. Public Utilities. Third Reading. Representative Woolard. Representative Woolard, on House Bill 479. Out of the record. Special Call, Revenue, Third Readings, Representative Steczo, House Bill 808. Out of Representative McGuire, House Bill Representative McGuire? Representative McGuire? Out of record. Representative Hicks, House Bill 1711, 1736. Out of the record. House Bill 2371, Representative Ryder. Out of the record. Transportation, Roads Transportation. Third Reading, House Bill 95, Representative Lang. Out of the record. Representative Hicks, on House Bill 451. Out of the record. Seniors, Third Reading, Representative Granberg, House Bill 2008. Representative Granberg? Out of the record. Local Government, Third Reading, Special Call, House Bill 165, Representative Balanoff. Representative Balanoff? Out of the record. Representative Lang, 169? Out of the Representative 694. record. Turner, House Bill Representative Turner? Out of the record. Representative DeJaegher, House Bill 950. Representative DeJaegher, House Bill 950? Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 950, a Bill for an Act amending the Senior Citizens and Disabled Persons Property Tax Relief and Pharmaceutical Assistance Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Currie: "Representative DeJaegher."

DeJaegher: "Thank you, Madam Chairman, Chairwoman, Members of the General Assembly. Madam, what I would like to do is to...

Madam Chairwoman, what I would like to do is to bring this Bill back for the removal of an Amendment. The Republican Party basically stated that this Amendment is a hostile Amendment. They could not support the Amendment in its

51st Legislative Day

April 28, 1993

present form, and I've also been led to believe with the removal of this particular Amendment, talking to the Minority Spokesman, that they would have no problems with this Bill. So, I would like to remove (and I have the cooperation of the Sponsor), to remove Amendment #4, then have leave to call this Bill."

- Speaker Currie: "Representative DeJaegher asks leave to return this Bill to the Order of Second Reading to remove an Amendment. Does he have leave? Seeing no objection, leave is granted. Clerk, read the Bill on Second."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 950, the Bill has been read a second time previously. Amendments 1, 3 and 4 have been adopted to the Bill. No Motions filed. No Floor Amendments."

Speaker Currie: "Representative DeJaegher."

DeJaegher: "May I have leave to call the Bill now?"

- Speaker Currie: "Representative DeJaegher moves to table Amendment #4 to House Bill 950. All in favor of the Motion signify by saying 'aye'; opposed, 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, and the Motion is tabled. Third Reading. Representative DeJaegher, the Chair would recommend that you give us a little time just to revisit the Bill before we come back to it in a few minutes. We'll come back to it. Let's return to Education, Special Call on Education, House Bill 2107. Representative Levin. Representative Levin? Representative Levin? Let's go back to 2107. status of this Bill, Clerk?"
- Clerk Rossi: "This is House Bill 2107. It's been read a third time previously."
- Speaker Currie: "Representative Levin, I believe you've already discussed the Bill, and I believe Representative Black did get his question answered. Representative Black."
- Black: "Yes, thank you very much, Madam Speaker. I appreciate

51st Legislative Day

April 28, 1993

the Sponsor taking it out the record and talking briefly, and the Bill seems to be in good shape. Ready to vote."

Speaker Currie: "Representative Levin moves 'do pass' on House Bill 2107. All in favor signify by voting 'aye'; opposed, 'no'. Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this Bill, there are 114 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'; and House Bill 2107, having received the required Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Continuing on the Special Call, State and Local Government, Order of Representative Phelps, House Bill 1055. Representative Phelps? Out of the record. Representative Kotlarz, House Bill 1565. Out of the record. Representative Lang, Bill 2207. Representative Lang? Out of the record. the Chair wishes to announce that we've gone through Special Orders, Third Readings. We've had two takers. As encouragement, the Chair would point out that both of them seem to be moving along quite nicely. We've actually passed one Bill this morning, so those of you who legislation that's ready to move, this is the time to move it. Let me also make another announcement, that on the second floor of the Capitol today there's a display of photographs, brochure and park district information that's provided by the Illinois Association of Districts. The exhibit is available between 9:30 morning and 3:30 this afternoon. So, check out the second floor as you walk about the building. Representative Black, for what reason do you rise?"

Black: "Yes, an inquiry of the Chair, Madam Speaker. Are we still on the Special Order of State Operations, Third Reading?"

Speaker Currie: "We don't seem to be on that order just at the

51st Legislative Day

April 28, 1993

- moment. I think what we're going to do is return to Second Readings. Second Readings, we'll start at the top here with Agriculture and Conservation. Representative Churchill, House Bill 1074. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 1074. The Bill has been read a second time previously. Amendments 1 and 4 have been adopted to the Bill. No Motions filed. No Floor Amendments."
- Speaker Currie: "Third Reading. House Bill 1990, Representative Representative Brunsvold, House Bill 1990? On Brunsvold. Second Reading. Out of the record. Let's try Business and Job Development, Second Reading, Representative Giolitto, House Bill 2267. Out of the record. Constitutional Officers, Second Reading. Who is handling House Bill for Representative LeFlore? Representative Morrow. Out of the record. Sorry, the Chair skipped Civil Justice, Second Representative Pugh, House Bill 224. Reading. Out of the record. Representative Lang, House Bill Representative Lang? Out of the record. Representative Blagojevich, House Bill 1468, Second Reading. Clerk, what is the status of this Bill?"
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 1468 has been read a second time previously. Amendments 1 and 3 have been adopted to the Bill. No Motions filed. Floor Amendment #4, offered by Representative Wennlund."
- Speaker Currie: "Out of the record. House Bill 1661 through 1664, Representative Homer. Representative Homer? Out of the record. Representative Lopez, House Bill 2191. Representative Lopez? Representative Lopez? Out of the record. Representative Lang, House Bill 2428. Out of the record. How about 2433, Representative Lang? record. Consumer Protection. Second Reading, Representative Schakowsky, House Bill 793. Out of the

51st Legislative Day

April 28, 1993

Education, Second Reading, House Bill record. Representative Hoffman. Representative Hoffman. the record. Elections and State Government, Second Reading, Representative Schoenberg, House Bill 660. Out of the record. Representative Curran, House Bill 704. Out of Representative Curran, House Bill Representative Curran? Out of the record. Representative House Bill 1745. Rotello, Out οf the record. Representative Prussing, House Bill 2296. Out of the record. Housing and Economic Development, Second Reading, Representative Turner, House Bill 529. Representative Turner. Representative Turner? Clerk, read the Bill."

- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 529. The Bill has been read a second time previously. Amendment #1 has been adopted to the Bill. No Motions filed. No Floor Amendments."
- Speaker Currie: "Third Reading. Representative Turner, on House Bill 1060. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 1060, the Bill has been read a second time previously. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Turner."

Speaker Currie: "Representative Turner."

Turner: "Thank you, Madam Chairman...Madam Speaker. Amendment #1
essentially becomes the Bill, and it is a technical
Amendment that was provided to me by the Illinois Housing
Development Authority. It provides for a legislative
finding that says that that there are dangerous levels of
lead in most housing units constructed before 1978. It
allows the Illinois Housing Development Authority to issue
mortgages or to make loans to banks of dangerous lead
levels on residential premises and allows the authority to
issue bonds not to exceed \$1 million in fiscal year '93 and
'94 for the financing of lead, for the removal of dangerous

51st Legislative Day

April 28, 1993

lead levels on residential premises. This was an Amendment that was drafted by the Illinois Housing Development Authority for this Bill, if in fact we intend to move it, and I move for the favorable adoption of Amendment #1 to House Bill 1060."

Speaker Currie: "Representative Turner moves 'do adopt' on Amendment #1; and, on that question, Representative Black."

Black: "Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Currie: "He will."

Black: "Representative, you have deleted... It's hard for me to read this, bear with me. It appears that you have deleted most of the language that deals with the HIV virus or Aids; is that correct?"

Turner: "That's correct, Representative."

Black: "And so basically, if I read this right, does the Amendment become the Bill?"

Turner: "The Amendment becomes the Bill. The authority right now may use his administrative funds for loans or grants to finance the costs of rehabilitating housing units for the homeless with Aids, so we didn't think that this language was necessary. And as I mentioned earlier, this language was drafted by the authority for me on this legislation."

Black: "But it no longer says anything that IDA must issue bonds in any aggregate amount to finance the low income housing for individuals, exclusively for individuals with the HIV virus?"

Turner: "That is correct, Representative."

Black: "And so really all it says now is...what it's just a bond authority Bill or...?"

Turner: "Yes, it is. It's for the removal of lead. It would allow them to do some bonding for lead abatement, lead

51st Legislative Day

April 28, 1993

hazard abatement."

- Black: "Okav. and does... Well. thank you very much, Representative. An inquiry of the Chair? Are we increasing the bonding limit for the Housing and Development Authority with this Bill, because I think that would require a super majority if that's the case?"
- Speaker Currie: "We will check and give you the answer to your question. In the meantime, shall we adopt the Amendment?"

 Black: "That's fine."
- Speaker Currie: "Representative Turner moves 'do adopt' on
 Amendment 1 to House Bill 1060. All in favor signify by
 saying 'aye'; opposed, 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The
 Amendment is adopted. Are there further Amendments?"

Clerk Rossi: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Currie: "Third Reading, and we'll hold this Bill while we get back to Representative Black. Representative Morrow, on House Bill 1238, continuing on the Housing and Economic Development call. Out of the record. Representative Bill 2283. Granberg, House Representative Granberg? Representative Granberg? Out of the record. Law, Second Reading, House Bill 769. Representative Representative Dunn? Out of the record. Local Government, Second Reading, Representative Lang, House Bill 168. of the record. Representative Capparelli, 175. Out of the Representative Lang, House Bill 550. Out of the record. Representative Steczo, House Bill 1236. Professional Regulations, Representative the record. Steczo, House Bill 618. Out of the record. Representative Santiago, House Bill 715. Representative Santiago, do you wish to call this Bill on Second? Out of the record. Public Utilities, Second Reading, Representative Giorgi, House Bill 1458. Representative Giorgi? Out of the

51st Legislative Day

April 28, 1993

record. Revenue, Second Readings, Representative Lang, the record. House Bill 7. Out of House Bill Representative Lang. Out of the record. Representative Levin, House Bill 1420. Out of the record. State and Second Reading, Representative Novak, Local Government, House Bill 103. Out of the record. Representative Schoenberg, House Bill 140. Out of the record. Representative Giolitto, House Bill 147. Representative Giolitto? Out of the record. Representative Giorgi, House Bill 1188. Out of the record. Representative Dart, House Bill 2171. Out of the record. Representative Hawkins, House Bill 2269. Clerk, read the Bill."

- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 2269. The Bill has been read a second time previously. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments."
- Speaker Currie: "Third Reading. Representative Hawkins, do you wish to call your Bill on Third? Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 2269, a Bill for an Act in relation to job creation. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Currie: "Representative Hawkins."
- Hawkins: "Madam Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this is a shell Bill that we would like to go to the Senate. Essentially, what we're trying to attempt to do is work with the Department of Corrections and the Department of Transportation in trying to create a resort on some state property in Jackson County. There is a lot of...gonna be a lot of negotiations have to go on on this Bill. I will, if it comes back, if we reach an agreement and it comes back to the House, I will not call this Bill unless it's been approved by Representative Wennlund."
- Speaker Currie: "Representative Hawkins moves 'do pass' on House Bill 2269; and, on that Motion, is there any discussion?

51st Legislative Day

April 28, 1993

Representative Black."

- Black: "Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. If there is an agreement on this Bill with my colleague, I'm not aware of that. So, perhaps we could, if the Sponsor wouldn't mind, wait a couple of minutes until Representative Wennlund can get back to the floor; he's with some constituents. I'm not aware of any such agreement on this vehicle Bill."
- Speaker Currie: "Representative Hawkins, do you want to take this

 Bill out of the record for a few moments? Representative

 Hawkins."

Hawkins: "Yes."

- Speaker Currie: "Out of the record. Representative, moving back on this order, House Bill 1188, Representative Giorgi.

 That Bill on State and Local Government call, Second Reading. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 1188. The Bill has been read a second time previously. Amendment #1 has been adopted to the Bill. No Motions filed. Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Homer."
- Speaker Currie: "Who's the Sponsor of the Amendment? Clerk,
 who's the Sponsor of the Amendment? Representative Homer.
 Representative Homer, for Amendment 2. Representative
 Homer? Is Representative Homer here? Representative
 Giorgi. Does Representative Giorgi have leave to represent
 Representative Homer's Amendment? He does. Representative
 Giorgi, on Amendment 2 to House Bill 1188."
- Giorgi: "Madam Speaker, Amendment #2 amends the Code of Criminal Procedure to extend the statube of limitations for bringing a criminal prosecution for certain criminal sexual offenses committed against children. And what Amendment #2 does, is moves one charge from felony to misdeameanor, and shortens the period when that action can be started to a year and

51st Legislative Day

April 28, 1993

six months. I agree with the Amendment. I want it as part of my Bill, and I'd like to...I'd move the adoption of the Amendment."

- Speaker Currie: "Representative Giorgi moves 'do adopt' on
 Amendment #2 to House Bill 1188; and, on that question, is
 there any discussion?" Representative Skinner."
- Skinner: "How long can a person delay in bringing charges of child abuse under this Amendment?"
- Giorgi: "An Amendment that has to do with a misdeameanor charge, a year and six months from the time it was committed. That's the Amendment."
- Skinner: "I've been hearing some women that have brought up..."
- Giorgi: "Cal, this Bill emanated from a situation in Winnebago County, where a faculty member of a high school committed sexual crimes against some of their students, and when their family went to the school board, the school board stonewalled and by the time they were done dealing with the school board, the statute of limitations had expired so that they couldn't file charges."

Skinner: "So this makes it longer?"

Giorgi: "Yes."

Skinner: "Fine. Thank you."

Speaker Currie: "Further discussion? Hearing none, all in favor of Amendment 2 to House Bill 1188 signify by saying 'aye'; opposed, 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk Rossi: "No further Amendments."

- Speaker Currie: "Third Restrict." "State and Local...I guess we did State and Local Government. Representative Blagojevich is now ready on House Bill 1468 on Second Reading. Clerk, would you remind us of the status of the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 1468. It's been read a second time

51st Legislative Day

April 28, 1993

previously. Amendments 1 and 3 have been adopted to the Bill. No Motions are filed. Floor Amendment #4, offered by Representative Wennlund."

Speaker Currie: "Representative Wennlund, on Amendment #4. The
Chair's recollection, Representative Wennlund, is that you
explained this Amendment for about ten minutes the last
time we were on this order, so the Chair would encourage
you to see if you can't keep it to, shall we say, two
minutes. Representative Wennlund."

Wennlund: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I will keep it two minutes. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this would bring Illinois into comformity with 30 other states, including the seven surrounding states, and put into place a method by which law-abiding citizens can carry weapons either on their person or in their vehicles by a permit process, after gun training and after extensive state police checks with respect to their mental background and their criminal background and would actually take care of... It has proven to work in all of the other states, not one has Indiana's had it since 1935, and in Florida repealed it. and in Oregon and all the most recent states, even the President's home state of Arkansas, it passed out of the Senate about two weeks ago and is being considered in their House now. It's something that's been a long time coming. has proven to reduce the amount of crime; and, in fact, states that have it, have a 50% less crime rate then states that don't have it. Madam Speaker, I ask for a Roll Call Vote on this Amendment and would encourage an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Currie: "Representative Wennlund moves 'do adopt' on
Amendment #4 to House Bill 1468; and, on that Motion,
Representative Blagojevich."

Blagojevich: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of

51st Legislative Day

April 28, 1993

the House. House Bill 1468 is a Bill that looked a lot different than it does today. This is the fourth Amendment that seeks to be attached to this Bill. I clearly recognize or view this Amendment as a hostile Amendment. In my opinion, the decision here is very clear, and it's The question is whether or not we ought to have more or less guns on the streets of the State The question is, are we gonna turn the State of Illinois. Illinois into Dodge City or will it remain the State of Illinois? If you believe that the proliferation of weapons in our society oughta continue, then perhaps you oughta consider voting for Representative Wennlund's Bill. If you believe that there oughta be real legitimate control with regard to the proliferation of weapons, then you oughta vote 'no'. This Bill would allow...or this Amendment would allow anybody within certain limitations to carry concealed weapon on his or her person in any public place. I have a question for Representative Wennlund? Can I ask him?"

- Speaker Currie: "Representative Wennlund will respond to a question."
- Blagojevich: "Representative, if this Bill were to pass, would teachers in schools and principals be allowed to carry concealed weapons into the school premises?"
- Wennlund: "No. Its prohibited from all public buildings. You cannot carry these into a courthouse or into a school building, or the capitol, or any other building like that, that the expressly prohibited."

Blagojevich: "Okay. Thank you."

Speaker Currie: "Representative Schakowsky, further discussion."

Schakowsky: "Thank you, Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise in strong opposition to this Amendment that

51st Legislative Day

April 28, 1993

I think will increase the danger of Illinois citizens. The right to carry a concealed weapon does not increase our safety and our confidence that we can be safe on the streets, it only enhances the danger. Those people who are sincere about wanting to do something about crime, about violence, about handgun deaths, this is one that you should absolutely be voting 'no' on. I urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Currie: "The question is, 'Shall Amendment 4 to House
Bill 1468 be adopted?' All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed
vote 'no'. Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have
all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Vote Hawkins
'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish?
Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record.
On this Amendment, there are 29 voting 'aye', 77 voting
'no' and the Amendment fails. Are there further
Amendments?"

Clerk Rossi: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Currie: "Representative Lang, for what reason do you rise?"

Lang: "Madam Speaker, before you move the Bill to Third Reading, there's an Amendment that I sponsored that's on this Bill that I wish to table."

Speaker Currie: "Representative Lang moves to table Amendment...

Do we know which Amendment?"

Lang: "Does the Clerk know which Amendment was my Amendment?"

Speaker Currie: "We're checking that."

Clerk Rossi: "Amendment #1 was sponsored by Representative Lang."

Speaker Currie: "Representative Lang moves to table Amendment #1 to House Bill 1468; and on that Motion, is there any discussion? Hearing none, all in favor signify by saying 'aye'; opposed, 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is tabled. Representative Brunsvold."

51st Legislative Day

April 28, 1993

- Brunsvold: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I also have an Amendment on this Bill. Could the Clerk inform me whose Amendment was #2? Is that Amendment on the Bill?"
- Clerk Rossi: "(Amendment) #2 was withdrawn. (Amendment) #3 was sponsored by Representative Brunsvold."
- Brunsvold: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. In the move to cooperation here, I would like to withdraw Amendment #3."

Speaker Currie: "I think the Motion is to table..."

Brunsvold: "Have it tabled."

- Speaker Currie: "Table Amendment #3 to House Bill 1468. Any discussion? Hearing none, all in favor signify by saying 'aye'; opposed, 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is tabled. Further business in respect to House Bill 1468? If not, Third Reading. On the Order of Local Government, Third Reading, Representative Schoenberg is ready with House Bill 1635. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 1635, a Bill for an Act amending the Counties Code. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Currie: "Representative Schoenberg."
- Schoenberg: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 1635 reduces the number of storm water management planning councils which are eligible to be formed in Cook County, reduces them from seven to six, by deleting the upper Des Plaines River as the planning council. There also been some changes in what constitutes membership, and this is an initiative of the Northwest Municipal Conference. I know of no opposition, and I'd urge your support."
- Speaker Currie: "Representative Schoenberg moves 'do pass' on House Bill 1635; and on that question, Representative Hartke."
- Hartke: "Well, thank you, Madam Speaker. It's not about this

51st Legislative Day

April 28, 1993

Bill. It was a parlimentary inquiry. Could you come back to me when you finish this?"

- Speaker Currie: "Sure. Hearing no discussion, the question is,
 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed
 vote 'no'. Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have
 all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this
 Bill, there are 111 voting 'aye'; 0 voting 'no'; and House
 Bill 1635, having received the required Constitutional
 Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative
 Hartke, for a parliamentary inquiry."
- Hartke: "Yes, Madam Speaker. I have a question on the position now of Representative Blagojevich's Bill. Did you announce Third Reading for that Bill?"
- Speaker Currie: "The Bill is on Third Reading, minus all of its
 Amendments."

Hartke: "Thank you very much."

Speaker Currie: "So, go back to the Bill as originally introduced, and that's House Bill 1468."

Hartke: "Okay, thank you."

- Speaker Currie: "Check it out, just in case we get back there this morning. The Chair would like to remind the Members that we are shortly currently going to the Order of Appropriations. So, substantive Bills that you want to work on, the Chair would strongly advise that we move to those Bills now. Let us return to House Bill 1060, which is on the Order of Housing and Economic Development. That's Representative Turner's Bill on Third Reading. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 1060, a Bill for an Act amending the Illinois Housing Development Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Currie: "Before we go to Representative Turner, there was

51st Legislative Day

April 28, 1993

a question from Representative Black on the requirement. Representative Black, in answer to vour question about the vote requirement, 'Yes there is an increase in bond obligation, but they're not general obligation bonds. So, the vote requirement Constitutional Majority vote requirement, 60 votes'. Representative 'do Turner, on the pass' Motion. Representative Turner."

Turner: "Thank you, Madam Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Assembly. As we mentioned earlier today, House Bill 1060 is a Bill which allows the Illinois Housing Development Authority to issue bonds for the lead hazard abatement and the removal of lead hazards from residential properties throughout the State of Illinois. It also... Well currently, the authority may use administrative funds for loans or grants to finance the cost of rehabing housing units for the homeless with Aids, and it allows the authority to issue bonds not to exceed \$1 million in fiscal year '93 and '94, for the funding of these loans for the removal of lead hazard, and I move for the favorable adoption of House Bill 1060."

Speaker Currie: "Representative Turner moves 'do pass' on House Bill 1060; and, on the question, Representative Biggert.

And on that question, hearing no discussion, the question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'no'. Oh wait, sorry, Representative Wennlund. You didn't have your light on, Representative Wennlund, but now you do, you may speak."

Wennlund: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Currie: "He will."

Wennlund: "Representative Turner, Amendment #1, how does that change the Bill?"

51st Legislative Day

April 28, 1993

- Turner: "Representative, Amendment #1 essentially becomes the Bill. And as I mentioned in earlier discussion, Amendment #1 was an Amendment that was drafted with the assistance of the Illinois Housing Development Authority."
- Wennlund: "And the Illinois Housing Development Authority is in favor of this issue?"

Turner: "Yes, they are."

- Wennlund: "And does it... I don't see it in the Amendment, but
 does this somehow increase the authority of the housing
 authority to issue bonds for victims of Aids?"
- Turner: "Representative, it removed the language dealing with people with Aids. In fact, as I mentioned earlier, the authority can currently use administrative funds for loans or grants to finance the cost of rehabing housing units for the homeless with Aids, or just homeless in general. So, they have that authority right now, and what we did was we removed the bonding requirement for dealing with HIV people."
- Wennlund: "So, what does it do then? If you remove the bonding authority for HIV..."
- Turner: "Right. It just deals with bonding for the lead hazard abatement for residential properties throughout the state, for the removal of lead hazards."

Wennlund: "Thank you very much."

Speaker Currie: "Any further discussion? If not, the question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On House Bill 1060, there are 112 voting 'aye', 0 voting 'no'; and this Bill, having received... Representative Moore, 'aye'. Representative Lou Jones, 'aye'. On this Bill, 114 voting 'aye', 0 voting

1.86

51st Legislative Day

April 28, 1993

'no'; and this Bill, having received the required Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Giorgi, House Bill 1188. Representative Giorgi. Representative Giorgi. Clerk, read the Bill. House Bill 1188."

Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 1188, a Bill for an Act amending the Code of Criminal Procedure of 1963. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Currie: "Representative Giorgi."

Giorgi: "Madam Speaker, the background for this Bill is that there was a case in Winnebago County where a high school instructor took advantage of some of the ladies in his classes, and when it came to the attention the mothers, they went to the school board and expected the school board to do something about it. They stonewalled it until the statute of limitation ran out, and this extends the statute of limitation for those type crimes."

Speaker Currie: "Representative Giorgi moves 'do pass' on House Bill 1188; and, on that, is there any discussion? Hearing none, the question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Vote Dunn 'aye'. John Dunn, 'aye', and Flinn, 'aye'. Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this Bill, voting 'aye', 0 voting 'no'; and House Bill 1188, having received the required Constitutional Majority, is declared passed. Let us return to Representative DeJaegher's Bill, House Bill 950. House Bill 950. Clark. read the Bill."

Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 950, a Bill for an Act amending the Senior Citizens and Disabled Person Property Tax Relief and Pharmaceutical Assistance Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

51st Legislative Day

April 28, 1993

Speaker Currie: "Representative DeJaegher."

DeJaegher: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. With the removal of Amendment #4 to House Bill 950, I believe all opposition has been eliminated from this piece of legislation. Bill) 950 is similar legislation they presently have in New Jersey and Pennsylvania. The only thing is, those two particular states require a certain specific amount of money as a rebate proposal from the pharmaceutical. Mine is voluntary in nature. Voluntary in nature, asking the drug companies to be somewhat lenient and see if they can be acceptive to a proposal that would return a certain amount of money that currently that we issue under the Circuit Breaker Program. If any money in rebate proposals is given to us by these various drug manufacturers, that money would then be used to enlarge our present Circuit Breaker Program; and I stand ready to answer any question pertaining to anything that anybody has pertaining to House Bill 950. I believe that we have to make the public aware that basically we are receptive to what's taking place in the drug industry in the United States today, and if there are no questions, hopefully that you will support this Bill unanimously. Thank you."

Speaker Currie: "Representative DeJaegher moves 'do pass' on
House Bill 950; and, on the question for discussion,
Representative Kubik."

Kubik: "Thank you, Speaker. Would the Sponsor yield for a question?"

Speaker Currie: "He will."

Kubik: "Representative, my understanding is that Floor Amendment
#3 is on the Bill? Is that correct? Okay. So, what
this...with Floor Amendment #3, this program is totally
voluntary. There's no mandate on the department. It's

. . .

51st Legislative Day

April 28, 1993

strictly a recommendation, so to speak."

DeJaegher: "You...You are right, Representative Kubik. The only mandate, if it could be considered a mandate, would be the Department of Revenue would be the clearinghouse, so to speak, and they would be in charge of collecting said money that would be offered to them by these various pharmaceuticals as a rebate."

Kubik: "My understanding, also, is that department is not opposed to this Bill as it is constructed."

DeJaegher: "When Amendment #4 was taken from this Bill, the

Department of Revenue was no longer in opposition of this

piece of legislation."

Kubik: "Okay. Thank you, I would urge we support House Bill 950."

DeJaegher: "Thank you."

Speaker Currie: "Further discussion? Representative Stephens."

Stephens: "Well, thank you, Madam Speaker. Without Amendment 4 on this Bill, we stand in support. Representative, it's high time that we send this message. We don't need to mandate the manufacturers, but we do need to recognize the marketplace and they are giving rebates, and the State of Illinois should benefit from those rebates. We applaud your efforts and your stewardship of this Bill. We join with you on this side of the aisle in support of this Bill."

Speaker Currie: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 950 pass?'

All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Flowers, 'aye'. Flowers, 'aye'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On House Bill 950, lll voting 'aye', 0 voting 'no'; and this Bill, having received the required

51st Legislative Day

April 28, 1993

Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Blagojevich, we're ready to go back to your Bill on the Order of Civil Justice, House Bill 1468. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 1468, a Bill for an Act amending the Criminal Code of 1961. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Currie: "Representative Blagojevich."

Blagojevich: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This Bill creates the offense of gang conscription. Gang conscription, the crime occurs when a person threatens another person for refusing to join a gang, or threatens one when someone tries to withdraw from a gang, or attempts to withdraw from a criminal street gang. The penalty is a Class III felony. The definition of street gang' in this Bill is 'any ongoing organization, association or group of three or more persons with an established hierarchy, that has one of its primary activities the commission of one or more criminal acts'. In my district, and throughout the City of Chicago, gangs are running rampant. It's important that we do something with regard to curtailing the activities of these Bill is important because it does a couple of things. It makes it more difficult, hopefully, for those who would people to join gangs and, also, provides a sufficient punishment and deterent, hopefully, for those who would seek to threaten those who want to withdraw from a gang. So, I encourage 'aye' votes on this Bill."

Speaker Currie: "Representative Blancevich moves 'do pass' on House Bill 1468; and, on that question ,is there any discussion? Representative Wennlund."

Wennlund: "Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield? What Amendments are left on this Bill, if any?"

51st Legislative Day

April 28, 1993

Blagojevich: "None."

Wennlund: "None?"

Speaker Currie: "Representative Blagojevich."

Wennlund: "Was Representative Lang's Amendment #1, was that tabled?"

Blagojevich: "Yes, he tabled that."

Wennlund: "He tabled it, and also Representative Brunsvold?

Blagojevich: ""Yes."

Speaker Currie: "And your Amendment lost, Representative Wennlund, so that's not on the Bill, either."

Wennlund: "Well, I'm well aware of that, Madam Speaker. How is this any different from Representative Walsh and Representative Homer's Bill, 2113, that passed a year ago in its definition of 'criminal street gang'; how do they differ?"

Blagojevich: "They're different, and I'm reading from these notes 'cause they're a little bit complex. Representative Walsh's Bill defines a 'criminal street gang' as 'an ongoing organization, association or group of three or more persons, whether formal or informal, having as one of its primary activities the commission of one or more criminal acts that has a common name or common identifying symbol, or specific color apparel displayed and whose members individuallly or collectively engaged in a pattern of criminal activity'. My Bill does not require that you show that there is a certain color apparel or a specific symbol or design. Representative Homer's Bill different, in that his definition of a 'criminal street gang' also requires the insignia and that there show a common name. My Bill does not require those."

Wennlund: "Oh, thank you very much."

Speaker Currie: "Further discussion? Representative Stephens."

51st Legislative Day

April 28, 1993

Stephens: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Representative Blagojevich, in Washington there's a...there's a sense now that you're obliged to wear a saxophone on your lapel. Would your Bill, in any way, prohibit people from removing that saxophone because of the ever increasing talk of taxation in Washington, and turning it in for say a GOP lapel pin, or anything like that? They wouldn't be prevented, would they?"

Wennlund: "No, in fact, Representative Walsh's Bill might actually get you guys in trouble for that, because his requires a symbol or insignia or a combination."

Stephens: "Well, there is a...there's a rising tide of those who are trading those saxophones for GOP lapel pins, and we wouldn't want to do anything to interfere with that, would

Wennlund: "We certainly would not."

Stephens: "I appreciate that endorsement, Sir."

Wennlund: "Thank you."

Speaker Currie: "Further discussion? Representative Frederick."

Frederick: "Thank you. Thank you, Madam Speaker. Would the Sponsor yield for a question?"

Speaker Currie: "He will."

Frederick: "Representative, does your Bill also include penalties when someone tries to leave a gang and is being prevented from doing that?"

Blagojevich: "Yes, Ma'am. It's the same offense. If you try to recruit somebody or if someone tries to withdraw and you threaten them,"

Frederick: "Okay. Thank you."

Speaker Currie: "Further discussion? Hearing none, the question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' I'm sorry, wait just a minute, Representative Lou Jones. Representative Turner, in the

51st Legislative Day

April 28, 1993

Chair."

Jones, L.: "Thank you, Madam Chairman and Members of the House.

Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Currie: "He will."

- Jones, L.: "Representative Blagojevich, in your Bill...your Bill says that if someone tries to entice someone to join a gang or keeps them from leaving a gang. Am I correct? What provisions are in this Bill to protect another innocent teenager or youngster? Let me give you an example: Say someone was trying to get even with somebody, and here's a good kid over here, and somebody says, 'It could be a gang banger, who could turn the tables, and say he tried to make me join a gang.' The only way that this kid, this good kid, could get by this is have to go to court. Am I correct?"
- Blagojevich: "Well, first of all, the local law enforcement authorities hopefully would exercise discretion with regard to charging somebody of an offense. Assuming that they failed in their discretion and their judgment was poor and they charged somebody, then the natural presumption of innocence applies on any criminal charge. I mean, I understand your concern, but that's a concern that we have on any criminal charge offense that exists, whether or not the right person is charged, and whether or not the state can prove the case beyond a reasonable doubt."
- Frederick: "Well, you know I deal on the premise that's there more good kids out here than bad kids, and I think when you have regislation like this, you have to put some kind of safeguards in the legislation for the good kids, and I think it's just...your Bill is a little bit too wide open.

 I mean, I think you're gonna end up getting some innocent youngsters could be harassed or get hurt by your Bill, and

51st Legislative Day

April 28, 1993

I'm gonna urge a 'no' vote on your Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Further discussion? Seeing no further discussion, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 14...' I'm sorry, Representative... The Lady from St. Clair, Representative Younge."

Younge: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Turner: "He indicates he will."

Younge: "Right. Would you define or describe again the definition of a 'gang' in the Bill?"

Blagojevich: "Yes Ma'am. 'Criminal street gang' in this Bill defined as: 'An on-going organization, association, or group of three or more people that has an established hierarchy within that group, and one of its primary activities is the commission of one or more criminal acts.' So, it requires three people to conspire together with a hierarchy within that group of people. It's not enough just to have three people together, but there has to be a hierarchy developed within that group and the primary activities of the group is to commit criminal acts. All of those elements would have to be proven in order to prove that you have (a) a street gang, and then you'd have prove that either somebody was enticed to ioin or threatened to join, or someone was threatened not to leave."

Younge: "How is... What is the definition of criminal acts?

Would a... If a group of people got together and jaywalked
or speeding, what is the definition of 'criminal act'?"

Blaywork: "Jaywalking or speeding would be... Jaywalking would be a petty offense, so that would not be covered under this. Speeding is a traffic offense, so that would not be covered. 'Criminal acts' would be, I suppose, any Class A misdeameanor or felony."

51st Legislative Day

April 28, 1993

Younge: "Is that what the Bill says?"

Blagojevich: "If it doesn't, Representative, I'd be happy to be more specific if it gets to the Senate and draft that in there, and specifically say what 'criminal acts' we're talking about."

Younge: "I think it's clear that this Bill is not ready for passage, because it's loose having to do with the definition of 'criminal acts'. Clearly, if people decide that they will jaywalk or speed or what have you, it's defective and should be voted down."

Speaker Turner: "Further questions? Representative... The Lady from Cook, Representative Davis."

Davis: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield? Representative Blagojevich, what are the penalties for, I guess attempting to recruit? What are the penalties?"

Blagojevich: "If you're convicted of this offense,
Representative, it would be a Class III felony, which could
be two to five years, but it's probationable. So, a first
offender could get probation. I would also say that there
is discretion within the prosecutors office to determine
each case and decide whether or not they want to downgrade
the case to a misdeameanor, but it's a Class III felony;
that's the penalty."

Davis: "And a Class III felony is, how many years?"

Blagojevich: "Two to five."

Davis: "Now, are we talking about any age group here?"

Blagojevich: "I'm sorry, I didn't hear that."

Davis: "What is your age group? Age group."

Blagojevich: "Oh, age group. Anybody who's an adult would be charged as an adult. Anybody who is a juvenile would be charged as a juvenile and the case would be heard at the

51st Legislative Day

April 28, 1993

juvenile court."

- Davis: "Representative, what kinds of things are in the Bill that ask that, that act as proof? For example: I'm John Brown, and I say to Marlin Smith, 'I want you to join this gang'. What does Marlin Smith have to do to prove that I made this recruitment of you?"
- Blagojevich: "Again, that would be the burden that the prosecutor would have, to prove his or her case beyond a reasonable doubt, as they have to prove any criminal case. Obviously, the testimony of the one that's seeking the recruited person will probably control that particular case. If that person testified and said, 'Dan Burke threatened me if I did not join the gang', then the credibility... Let's say I was the one who said, 'Dan Burke's trying to make me join this gang, and I don't want to do it, and he's threatening me to join and so forth', it would be my credibility as a witness against his, and I would to...my testimony, the weight of it, would have to be determined by a judge or jury beyond a reasonable doubt."
- Davis: "Representative, what is your Bill number? I think, is it 1466 or 67, that seeks to provide some recreational facilities with dollars for young people today? What's your Bill number?"
- Blagojevich: "I don't have that Bill, but I'd like to have that."

 Davis: "Oh, oh okay, you don't, I'm sorry. It was someone else.

 Representative, my final question to you is, 'How many young people do you think will be convicted of this crime; and once convicted, tell me where they go?' Now, I mean
- Blagojevich: "Again, if you're a minor, if you're not an adult, then they would be tried in the juvenile court system, and that, of course, would be based...the punishment or the

underage, under 21, under 18, where will they go?"

51st Legislative Day

April 28, 1993

penalty or the sentence would be determined by the judge and the juvenile court system, and every case is different. The judges would have to consider the person's prior background, and the person's history and so forth, their economic situation, their family situation, their schooling; all of those things."

Davis: "Is fratricide included in this Bill? Is gang recruitment more severe than fratricide?"

Blagojevich: "Fratricide is not in this Bill."

Davis: "What is 'fratricide'?"

Blagojevich: "Fratricide is worse than gang recruitment."

Davis: "What is it?"

Blagojevich: "Fratricide is killing one's brother isn't it?"

Davis: "Parent."

Blagojevich: "Parent, fair enough. That's awful."

Davis: "That's not it. Patricide."

Blagojevich: "Oh, patricide. I'm sorry."

Davis: "Well, I wondered why we don't see some Bills on fratricide and patricide, where people are killing their families, and we're giving, it appears, sentences to young people where it would appear they had killed their parents."

Blagojevich: "I agree that patricide is an evil thing, and so is fratricide...and Thou shalt not kill..."

Davis: "Do you think patricide, do you think that's more evil than gang recruitment?"

Blagojevich: "Yes, I do, absolutely."

Davis: "Have you got any Bills on it?"

Blagojevich: "No, I don't. But, the law's already covering that.

There is no law right now that covers gang recruitment."

Davis: "I think there's a law against murder."

Blagojevich: "Well, fratricide would not be a Class II felony, it

51st Legislative Day

April 28, 1993

would be ...or Class III felony, that would be a Class X." Davis: "To the Bill, to the Bill, Mr. Speaker. What we do first of all, is pass legislation to open boot camps, and then we sit down and decide now how are we gonna fill those boot camps up; we need some prisoners. What laws can we pass to prisoners to put in those boot camps? This time, it's gang recruitment. Next time, it might be tying your shoelace. Because, since we decided to have those boot camps, we must fill them up. Each time we pass legislation to build a prison or to have a boot camp, or to imprison people, the next step is to pass legislation to fill that place up. This will cost the taxpayers over \$300 million in approximately one year. Now, if we have \$300 million to spend because one child said something about or against another child, and the prosecutor has to prove it using taxpayer dollars), then let's pass this legislation. Otherwise, let's get down to serious business of the problem of crime and youth delinquency in the State of Illinois."

Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Pugh."

Pugh: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House.

Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Turner: "He indicates he will."

Pugh: "Representative Blagojevich, the definition of a 'street gang' is the...as defined in House Bill 126 as 'the ongoing organization, association, or three or more persons, whether formal or informal, having as one of its primary activities the commission of one or more criminal acts that has a common name or common identifying sign, symbol or specific color apparel displayed and whose members individually or collectively engage in a pattern οf criminal activity'. Is that correct?"

51st Legislative Day

April 28, 1993

- Blagojevich: "That's correct. That's House Bill 126, and that's Representative Walsh's Bill."
- Pugh: "Is that the same definition as applies to your conscription Bill?"
- Blagojevich: "No, it's different. Mine is...mine says that you don't have to show common name or common identifying specific color apparel. Where... What I have, symbol or have that they don't in their Bill. or what Representative's Walsh doesn't have, is you have to in this crime that there is an established hierarchy to the group of three or more people. So, it's not enough just to go around wearing a Chicago White Sox's jacket or Chicago Hornets jacket, or whatever the color might be, irrelevant in my Bill. You've got to show that there's a group of people, there is an established hierarchy within that group and that what's makes it a gang."

Pugh: "Who determines the hierarchy?"

- Blagojevich: "Okay, that's a factual question, that again either the...if it ever got to a judge, that a judge would have to decide or a jury, or prior to that, the law enforcement would have to use their judgment to determine whether or not there is, in fact, a hierarchy that exists in that group of people, and that it meets this definition. These are all factual questions."
- Pugh: "On the front page of the Sun Times, you've got 14 CTA workers, that I assume all wear CTA uniforms, suspended in a theft probe. Would they apply under this Bill as a 'gang'?"
- Blagojevich: "No, unless you could show that Robert Bellcaster and the hierarchy of the CTA made it a goal of the CTA to commit those crimes. If you were able to show that, it might come under this Bill. But in absence of that, if you

51st Legislative Day

April 28, 1993

can't prove that, then no, those people worked...went on their own and they were off committing their own separate crime, not part of any ongoing conspiracy with the hierarchy and so forth."

Pugh: "Couldn't they be a gang by themselves, based on the description that you have in the Bill?"

Blagojevich: "If... How many were arrested on that, Coy?"
Pugh: "Fourteen."

Blagojevich: "Okay. So, if you can show that the 14 got together and had a meeting and there was a hierarchy and there was, you know, a president and vice-president, treasurer of this group and their goal was to... commit certain criminal acts like those, and let's say one of the 14 wanted to leave that group and the other 13 threatened that person then, yes, this Bill would apply in that case."

Pugh: "That's one of the problems I have with the Bill. Overall, we as Legislators have begun...or we've not only begun, but we've taken on the...some of the things that Governor Thompson began with the Class X felony. We've...we're dealing with crime and criminal activity on the back end, and we're not addressing it in...on the front end with prevention, and until we begin to look at the problem of prevention, then we'll continue to fill our prisons and build more prisons that we cannot afford. So, I urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative McAuliffe."

McAuliffe: "Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question."

Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman moves the previous question. All those in favor should say 'aye'; all those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it.

The previous question is there. Representative

51st Legislative Day

April 28, 1993

Blagojevich, to close."

Blagojevich: "What I would just like to say, and I'd to respond just to what, Representative Pugh said; I agree that there has to be a lot more attention done on the front end, as Representative Pugh said. And I think you'll find that comes to my voting record, any good idea that addresses underlying social problems, I'm very interested in trying to apply those. However, what do we do in the meantime? Crime is ravaging our streets. People, law-abiding citizens can't feel safe walking through the We have to do something to address the problem present right now, and this in a small part, addresses one of the many problems we have with crime in our society. So, I'm very sensitive to the social problems and, again, I'm very eager, as Representative Pugh is, to see that we do something on the front end and prevent these crimes from even happening and create an environment makes people more productive and more eager to focus their energies in lawful productive ways. But, still we have a problem that's present today and we have...we're confronted with it, and gangs are a big problem and this Bill addresses part of that problem. So, I urge 'yes' Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 1468 pass?'

All those in favor say 'aye'; all those opposed say 'no'.

The voting is now open. The Gentleman from Cook,

Representative Ostenburg, to explain his vote, one minute."

Ostenburg: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. To explain my vote. The reason I'm voting against this Bill is I think the language is so loose that an organization that's involved in a protest for purposes of civil disobedience could, in fact, be covered under this

51st Legislative Day

April 28, 1993

Bill. They would be an organized group, they would be protesting a civil injustice and they would be accused of being a 'gang' engaging in 'gang' activities. I think that that's an infringement of our first Amendment liberties, and I think that this vote...this Bill needs to be voted down. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Santiago, one minute to explain your vote."

Santiago: "Thank you Mr. Speaker and Member of the General Assembly. I rise in support of this Bill. I think it is a Bill that addresses the serious problem in my community. We know about gangs. There're criminal organizations, working within our community. They're just criminals that we have the responsibility, as Legislators, to send out a hard and strong message that we will not tolerate gangs and gang members. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall record. On this question, there are 96 voting 'yes', 13 voting 'no'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional required Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill There was a computer problem earlier with this roll call on House Bill 1060 of which I am the Sponsor. At this point...the... we'd like to take another record vote on House Bill 1060. The question is, 'Shall House Bill 1060 pass?' All those in favor should vote 'aye'; all those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is now open. Have all voted Have all voted of a wish? The Clerk shall take who wish? the record. On this question, there are 108 voting 'aye', 1 voting 'no', 1 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the required Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2207, Representative Lang.

51st Legislative Day

April 28, 1993

Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 2207, a Bill for an Act in relation to games of chance. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Lang."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Lang: Bill 2207 has been thoroughly debated. discussed the issues and the Amendment. Everybody knows what the issues are. We know that this is the initiative of State Treasurer Ouinn. This has been discussed on numerous occasions. It's a good Bill regarding ethics in the Illinois Gaming Board, and ethics regarding gambling in Illinois. I do want to state to the Members, because there's a rumor floating around that has to be quashed right now. This is not any vehicle for further gambling in Illinois. There is no intention by the Sponsor or by Mr. Quinn to expand any gambling in Illinois through This is 'not', repeat 'not' a vehicle Bill. this Bill. This is an ethics Bill which is important to remove any taint of lack of integrity in gaming in Illinois and that all it's for, and I'd ask for your 'aye' votes."

Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman from Wennlund, Representative...

The Gentleman from Will, Representative Wennlund."

Wennlund: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Can we have some order on the House floor, Mr. Speaker? The noise level is excessively high. Thank you very much. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, all there needs to be done is in the Senate to change one word to apply it to the City of Chicago and this could become the weblicle for land-based gambling; or land-based casinos in the City of Chicago. Ninety percent of what was Treasurer Quinn's initiative is gone and you can tell that because you didn't even see the Treasurer's people working the Democratic side of the aisle when

51st Legislative Day

April 28, 1993

Amendment #3 was put on it, and you don't see them today either. The Bill is flawed from start to finish with serious problems. It would even make an employee, who happens to have been passed a false ID by a young person on a riverboat and allows them to wager, is quilty of a Class IV felony, that's a three-to-six year term, even though he couldn't... Yeah, talk about overcrowded prisons, even though he could not tell the person was under 21. Merely because, and there is no escape in it. The other provisions that have a fail-safe in there deal with respect to serving liquor to minors, they don't deal with allowing a minor to wager, even though it may have been innocent and without the knowledge of the employee who permitted the minor to wager; Class IV felony. That's ridiculous. This Bill is really no longer the Treasurer's initiative. All of his hate stuff were stripped out of there by Amendment #3. This could very easily become I know what the Sponsor's good intentions are), could very easily become the vehicle for land based gambling and you may not want to be on that. You should defeat this Bill and put an end to this entire silliness."

Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman from Vermilion, Representative Black."

Black: "Thank you very much, Mr Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Turner: "He indicates he will."

Black: "Representative, on page 5 of the Amendment, and we are on Amendment 40 correct?"

Lang: "Correct."

Black: "All right. On page 5 of the Amendment, Line 12 there is a sentence that says, starts on line 11, I'm sorry, that says: 'All such fees and taxes shall be deposited into the

51st Legislative Day

April 28, 1993

state gaming fund, except as otherwise provided in this Act.' Where is the language that would tell me where those taxes and fees would be provided...or deposited?"

Lang: "One moment. Let me get back to you on that, Mr. Black.

Do you have any other questions?"

Black: "Oh you want to take this out of the record and get back to me? You want to continue?"

Lang: "No, let's continue."

Black: "Okay."

Lang: "We should have the answer for you before we're completed."

Black: "All right. Mr. Speaker?" Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Turner: "Yes, Representative Black."

Black: "We need some order in this chamber. This is a major piece of legislation."

Speaker Turner: "Can the Gentleman have quiet, please?"

Black: "I would direct all of you on either side of the floor, if you don't have a copy of this Amendment to get it. I want you to look on page 5 of the Amendment, starting on line 11, it goes on about where the fees will be deposited into the state gaming fund, but there is an addition. It says, on line 12, except as provided, except as otherwise provided in this Act, in this Amendment you will not (and I'll certainly stand corrected if the Gentleman finds I'm in error), I don't believe you will find in Amendment any place where the language says, 'as otherwise provided in this Act.' Could the, 'as otherwise provided' the City of Chicago? Furthermore, Ladies and Gentlemen House, let me call your attention to page 12, 'a covered person shall not accept and an owners license shall not knowingly provide directly or indirectly any complimentary service or discount, et cetra, et cetera, et cetera. Let me quote you from what is in another Bill.

51st Legislative Day

April 28, 1993

On page 59 of Senate Bill 1, it says, 'a covered person shall not accept and a gaming licensee shall not knowingly provide directly or indirectly in other words: Section 25-90 on page 59 of Senate Bill 1 has the same language. What is Senate Bill 1? Senate Bill 1, introduced November 17, 1992, by Senator Rock and Senator Marovitz, creates the Metropolitan Entertainment District and Casino Gambling Regulatory Act. Isn't this Chicago land-based casinos in Senate Bill 1? I further submit to you that all you have to do, all you have to do in this Amendment, which is deleted in the underlying Bill, the only thing deleted in the underlying Bill is I quote, 'cities over million.' Everything else is the same. So when this Bill goes to the Senate, if it should, all you have to put in there is cities over three million population-and we all that is, that's Chicago and then you have Senate Bill #1, creating land-based casino gambling in the City of Chicago. The Gentleman has said he's not...that's not his intent and I've view...I've found the Gentleman to be a man of honor, but I'll tell you what, if this isn't the first cousin to land-based casino gambling in Chicago, it's too I don't want to marry my first cousin. I close for me. don't want to support this Amendment. I'm telling ya', it's gonna come back, whether the Sponsor has the intent to bring it back or not. This is a usage Bill for a land-based casino gambling in the City of Chicago. You all know nothing dies around here. You think land-based casino gambling is dead in Chicago; right here the resurrection. The Sponsors can change, but the idea never seems to go away. I, in all due respect to the Sponsor, who I have a great deal of respect for and we have worked together on a lot of legis...legislation, and I mean that

51st Legislative Day

April 28, 1993

sincerely. It may not be his intent, but Ladies and Gentlemen, you take House Bill 2207, you send it to the Senate, no where in here does it say where that other moneys could go, change it to say it could go to Chicago, put back language that says cities over three million and you have Senate Bill 1, which is clearly, there's no question about this, Senate Bill 1 is clearly land-based casino gambling in the City of Chicago. You better take a long look at this. A 'no' vote may be advisable."

Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman from DuPage, Representative Persico."

Persico: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Turner: "He indicates he will."

Persico: "Representative...by whom...to whom do you mean a 'covered person'?" Who does that include, a 'covered person'?"

Lang: "A covered person is defined in the Amendment,
Representative, and let me find it for you. Page 11, lines
32 and 33, going on to page 12, for purposes of this Act
the term 'covered person' means a member of the board, any
employee or agent of the board."

Persico: "So, your Amendment then just covers people on gaming board, not owners or partial owners of riverboats or anything like that?"

Lang: "Well, that portion of the Amendment. Now, later in the Amendment, there...there is...there are many specific references to owners and partners and stockholders in boats."

Persico: "The concern that I have, is there...I keep getting conflicting reports on that. If a person is a owner or partial owner of a riverboat does that prohibit him from running for any public office or any other kind of position

51st Legislative Day

April 28, 1993

in your Bill?"

Lang: "Are you referring to some specific section of the Amendment you wish to point me to, Representative?"

Persico: "The part that I was...was, and I don't have Amendment 3 in front of me, I only have is Amendment 2, but it was on page 13 of Amendment 2, it says, 'the covered person shall not pursue any office,' and I guess I wanted to know who, by...to whom you meant a 'covered person' could not run for public office?"

Lang: "This just does not..."

Persico: "This is just the gaming board..."

Lang: "That section refers only to the gaming board, there is no similar provision relative to the owners."

Persico: "Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "No further questions? The quest...

Representative Lang, to close."

Lang: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Some comments need to be made. Firstly, the comment by one Representative, that underaged people are on the boat, someone, that lets that underaged person in, is going to be convicted of a Class IV felony; that's not what the Bill says. There are many, many, many exemptions. If somebody is provided a false I.D., et cetera, et cetera, so let's put that aside immediately. This Bill is about ethics; that's all it's about. If you vote against this Bill, you're voting against ethics in the Illinois Gaming Board. You're voting to continue the kinds of problems the Illinois Gaming Board You're voting...you're voting to say that you has had. don't care if there is integrity in the gambling we have in the State of Illinois. Let me further say that Treasurer has not ever said that, "he's interested in Quinn land-based casinos in Chicago,' so I don't think that's his

51st Legislative Day

April 28, 1993

intention on this Bill. It's certainly not mine. You all know that I'm Chairman of the House Task Force on Gaming, the Speakers Task Force on Gaming. We have spent a considerable amount of time, many hours and have many hours in studying this issue. And I am a Representative who would not be in a position of trying to sand-bag. you will, my committee. I am not out here on the House floor to try to do something separate and apart from the committee that we've been diligently running for months, and it's sort of insulting to me that anyone would think that this Representative would do anything on this House floor to move a Bill that would be in opposition to the current position of my task force, and the current position my task force is we are going to continue to study the issues of gaming until we are finished. When we may or may not have recommendations on the expansion of gambling, on whether we should have more boats or less boats or land-based casinos or video poker or whatever. So, it's insulting to me that anyone would think that I would stand on the House floor, when I have committee that's meeting every two weeks, (we have a meeting Monday. Come to our meeting, they are very interesting), we're studying these issues and I am not here on the House floor to try to expand gambling in the State of Illinois today and if I wish to do it, I don't need this vehicle. I have House Bill 7 on the Calendar. I don't need this vehicle. This vehicle is for ethics. Ethics in gambling, ethics in the Illinois Gaming Board in the State of Illinois. You're either for ethics or you're against ethics. This is the Bill to make that statement, and if you vote wrong, you will be paying the price in your districts, because your constituents want you to vote for

51st Legislative Day

April 28, 1993

ethics, for integrity in government. Vote 'aye'."

- Speaker Turner: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 2207 pass?'

 All those in favor should vote 'aye'; those opposed vote
 'no'. The voting is now open. The Gentleman from Cook,

 Representative Parke, one minute to explain your vote."
- Parke: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. If this Bill was just ethics, it would make it a lot easier for us, but there is so much involved in this legislation and it's so thick that we haven't really had a chance to look it over. If this gets the required number, we would like a verification of the roll call, Mr. Speaker."
- Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman from Lake, Representative Churchill."
- Churchill: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. You know it's kind of curious, I understand that the City of Chicago is working this Bill harder than the Treasurer. Wonder why that would be? I mean, come on, let's face it folks, this is a Bill that was identified for the fixed-site casino gambling for the City of Chicago and guess what the real question I have is, 'What did Pat Quinn have to do with this Bill?' Is this a deal between Pat Quinn and the Mayor? Is he looking for political support, so he can run for Governor? Is that what this deal is all about? This is a bad Bill. Vote 'no'."
- Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Morrow, one minute to explain your vote."
- Morrow: "Thank you, Madam...Madam Speaker, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House."
- Speaker Turner: "Thank you, Representative."
- Morrow: "I'm gonna probably vote for House Bill 2207, but if I do vote for it, it's not because of Pat Quinn. It's not

51st Legislative Day

April 28, 1993

because of the Mayor of the City of Chicago, because he had his chance to get riverboat three years ago and he turned it down. But if I do vote for House Bill 2207. because of a gentleman that defrauded this state. a built hotels with your gentleman that tax dollars and defrauded on the loan, not once, but twice and then he was able to get shares of a riverboat gambling and when those shares went public, he made a profit on those shares. Where's the outcry about him making a profit? Who has told him to repay the state for the money that he took? No one, this side of the aisle, not on that side of the aisle, not on the second floor and not from you, the media sitting up there. Where are you? You haven't said anything. So, if I do vote 'yes', it's not because of the Mayor of the City of Chicago, because I am against riverboat gambling and any type of gambling in the City Chicago until the Mayor of the City of Chicago sits down with the African-American community and talks to us about what's in it for us. That's why...that's why I won't vote for the Bill because of him, but because I am gonna vote for the Bill if it gets to 59, because we do need some ethics in this state. A gentleman can defraud taxpayers of a loan and an average citizen can't get a small business loan to create jobs. So, I urge votes, and Ι agree with the friends side...this side of the aisle. I've told the City οf Chicago, if that Bill comes back from the Senate with one word change, I'm gonna take somebody from the city (a) the woodshed."

Speaker Turner: "Bring your remarks to a close. The Lady from Cook, Representative Zickus."

Zickus: "Yes, I would like to explain my vote. I am for ethics

51st Legislative Day

April 28, 1993

and that's why I'm voting 'no' on this Bill, and I think if this Bill does become the land-based casino gambling as...that it's predicted it will, then anyone who is voting 'yes' on it is going to certainly have a lot of explaining to do to their constituents when they get back home. If you want land-based gambling in Chicago, then have the courage to vote for a Bill that says what it is, not one that... that's posing as an ethics Bill."

Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman from Grundy, Representative Weller."

Weller: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To explain my vote. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, it was said by one of our colleagues just a minute or two ago that this legislation was designed to deal with the conduct of individuals involved in operating riverboat gambling casinos. Frankly, that language was taken out of this Bill. The Sponsor even admitted it. What this Bill is, is a vehicle for Chicago's casinos, land-based Chicago casinos. If you don't want them, I don't think many of us do, 'no' votes is the right vote or 'present' vote is the right vote."

Speaker Turner: "The Lady from DuPage, Representative Biggert."

Biggert: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To explain my vote. I, too, think this is not an ethics Bill, but there are also other points that cause it to be flawed. For example: It...the Bill requires publicly traded companies intermediar...intermediary companies and holding companies to provide a complete list of shareholders and the interest held by each..."

Speaker Turner: "Proceed."

Biggert: "I would caution anyone who is near riverboat gambling that this is going to really affect you. If a riverboat company wants to go public and desire...desires to sell

51st Legislative Day

April 28, 1993

stocks, then specifically this Amendment would require the Gaming Board to give public notice of any such attempted action before it actually occurs; a provision that is really a gross violation of the Federal Securities and Exchange Commission. So, I urge you to look at this carefully. Thank you."

- Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman from Rock Island, Representative Brunsvold."
- Brunsvold: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I'm in a situation where I have a riverboat in my district; and, of course, I'm for ethics dealing with riverboats. I'm gonna support this Bill because that's what the Bill does now. I am not and never have been for land-based gambling in Chicago. I...that does not do my riverboats any good. I want to state that for the record. If this Bill comes back with...with land-based gambling from Chicago on it, I'm going to vote 'no'. But right now it's an ethics Bill, and I'm gonna support it."
- Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman from Kankakee, Representative Novak."
- Novak: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I just want to rise and explain my vote. You know the purpe...the perpetrating lies on the other side of the aisle indicating that this is a vehicle Bill for a land-based casino is ridiculous, so I just wanted to get up and explain my vote. This has nothing to do with it. I don't see why people aren't afraid to vote for good ethics in state government. That's why I'. Joting 'green'."
- Speaker Turner: "Have all voted who wish? The Gentleman from Will, Representative McGuire, one minute to explain your vote."
- McGuire: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It won't take but a minute.

51st Legislative Day

April 28, 1993

I'm from Joliet and you know we have riverboats, and I'd like to explain my vote the same as Representative Brunsvold. I'm voting on the issues as I see it today, and I have complete faith and trust in Lou Lang and I agree with Charles Morrow. If it comes back differently, I'm with Charles, we'll take somebody to the woodshed. I vote 'aye'."

- Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman from Saline, Representative Phelps."
- Phelps: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I, too, want to go on record in support of the legislation as it is worded in this Bill now that I think achieves at least a milestone effort for ethic achievement, and if it is used for any other purpose (which I do not believe it will be, because I think Representative Langs' word is good as gold). And for that I support this Bill."
- Speaker Turner: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. Representative...

 The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Morrow. On this question, there are 59 'yes', 36 'noes', 17 'presents'. We shall poll the absentees."
- Clerk Rossi: "A poll of those not voting. Representative Giglio."
- Speaker Turner: "The Sponsor requested it. Representative Pugh."
 Pugh: "I'd like my vote to be recorded as 'aye'."
- Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman requests an 'aye' vote. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Morrow."
- Morrow: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I...didn't get a chance to vote. I will vote 'aye', but I will emphasize again to the City of Chicago that if that Bill comes back over with any changes, I will take you to the woodshed and I won't need any help getting you in there."

51st Legislative Day

April 28, 1993

Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman from Rock Island, Rep...Rock Island, Representative DeJaegher."

DeJaegher: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. What we're basically dealing with here is ethics, ethics. I've been here for a little over ten years and I've always been a firm believer once a word is given by a Legislator, that word would not change. I believe that he is all honest in his presentation. We're basically dealing with ethics. It had better remain an ethics Bill, because in the event that this Bill should ever come back from the Senate, I would not be supportive of this legislation, so I behive...behooves all of us to test and see if there's such a thing as honor among Representatives, when hon...when word has been given by a Representative."

Speaker Turner: "The Lady from Cook, Representative Davis."

Davis: "Thank you, Mr...."

Speaker Turner: "Representative, Representative, the record was not announced, we... Representative... Representative Davis."

Davis: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker for allowing me to speak. I am so glad, Mr. Speaker... Blagojevich, is that a gang over there?"

Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Parke.

Representative Parke, do you want to proceed with the verification?"

Parke: "Well, can we ask...could we ask for a clarification of the Chair?"

Speaker Turner: "Do vc want to proceed with the verification, Representative?"

Parke: "Yes, I do."

Speaker Turner: "Okay."

Parke: "I wish they...somebody else would..."

51st Legislative Day

April 28, 1993

Speaker Turner: "Mr. Clerk, poll the affirmative votes."

- Clerk Rossi: "A poll of those voting in the Representatives Balanoff. Blagojevich. Brunsvold. Bugielski. Burke. Capparelli. Curran. Currie. Dart. DeJaegher. Edley. Erwin. Flinn. Flowers. Deering. Frias. Gash. Giolitto. Giorgi. Granberg. Hartke. Hicks. Hoffman. Homer. Jones, Lou. Jones, Shirley. Kaszak. Kotlarz. Lang. Laurino. Levin. Lopez. Martinez. Mautino. McAfee. McGuire. McPike. Moore, Eugene. Meyer. Morrow. Moseley. Novak. Ostenburg. Phelan. Phelps. Prussing. Pugh. Ronen. Rotello. Santiago."
- Speaker Turner: "Representative Parke... Excuse me, Mr. Clerk.

 Representative Parke, Representative Capparelli would like
 to have leave to be verified. Leave is granted."
- Clerk Rossi: "Saviano. Schakowsky. Schoenberg. Sheehy.

 Steczo. Stroger. Turner. von Bergen-Wessels. Woolard.

 Mr. Speaker." von Bergen-Wessels. Woolard. Mr. Speaker."
- Speaker Turner: "Questions of the Affirmative Roll Call. Before you start, Representative Davis. The Lady from Cook, Representative Davis."
- Davis: "Mr. Speaker, you know I was a bit confused and, I said,
 'Now am I voting for an ethics package or am I voting for
 riverboat gambling for Chicago? I don't know what I'm
 voting for, but after that tirade by that gang over there,
 by Blagojevich's first gang member recruitment, that we
 will change our vote to 'aye'."
- Speaker Turner: ". ford the Lady as 'aye'. Representative Parke, proceed with the Affirmative Roll Call."

Parke: "Representative..."

Speaker Turner: "Turn on Representative Parke."

Parke: "Could you turn it up a little bit? Thank you, I

51st Legislative Day

April 28, 1993

appreciate the courtesy, so that we can be heard. ...Could I have..."

Speaker Turner: "Can we have some order in the chamber, please?"

Parke: "Mr. Speaker, can you request that the Members be in their chairs so we can get a better view of who's there and who's not?"

Speaker Turner: "Staff, would you please retire to the rear.

Members, would you be in your seats?"

Parke: "Thank you, Representative. I appreciate that courtesy."

Speaker Turner: "Proceed, Representative."

Parke: "The first name is Representative Clem Balanoff?"

Speaker Turner: "Representative Balanoff?"

Parke: "No, he's not in his chair. I see."

Speaker Turner: "He's in the chamber."

Parke: "Representative Curran?"

Speaker Turner: "Representative Curran is standing in the back."

Parke: "I see. Representative Homer?"

Speaker Turner: "Representative Homer. Representative Homer? Is the Gentleman in the chamber? He is not here. Remove him...remove him from the roll call."

Parke: "Thank you. Representative Bugielski?"

Speaker Turner: "Representative Bugielski. Is the Gentleman in the chamber? He's in the back."

Parke: "Thank you. Thank you. Representative..."

Speaker Turner: "Excuse me, Representative... The Gentleman from Effingham, Representative Hartke. He'd like to have leave to be verified. Leave is granted."

Parke: " it's fine. Representative Steczo?"

Speaker Turner: "He's in his chair."

Parke: "Thank you. Representative Martinez?"

Speaker Turner: "Representative Martinez is in his seat."

Parke: "Martinez. I'm sorry. Representative Schoenberg? Where's

51st Legislative Day

April 28, 1993

he at?"

Speaker Turner: "Standing in the rear."

Parke: "Representative Shirley Jones?"

Speaker Turner: "Representative Jones. She's sitting here in the chamber."

Parke: "Representative Dunn? ...Wait a minute. I can't see over there. Oh, it's...there he is. Representative Burke?"

Speaker Turner: "He's in his chair."

Parke: "Representative Capparelli? Excuse me, that's right.

Representative Giorgi?"

Speaker Turner: "He's in his chair."

Parke: "Blagojevich? Representative Blagojevich? I don't see him."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Blagojevich. Representative Blagojevich? Is the Gentleman in the chamber? He's talking to his gang. He'll be right out."

Parke: "Well, Representative, is he here or is he not? If not, I would request that you remove him from the roll call."

Speaker Turner: "He's not here, Representative Parke. Would you remove him from the roll call?"

Parke: "Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Are there any further..."

Parke: "Well, we ask..."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Schakowsky asks leave to be verified."

Parke: "That will be fine."

Speaker Turner: "Return Representative Blagojevich to...to the roll call. Representative Parke, are there any affirmatives...any other..."

Parke: "Yes, I'd like to ask if...Representative Giolitto is here?"

Speaker Turner: "She's in her seat. The Gentleman from

51st Legislative Day

April 28, 1993

Vermilion, Representative Black. For what purpose do you rise?"

Black: "...I, whenever he's finished I would like to be recognized, Mr. Speaker. No...Mr. Speaker, let me if I might..."

Speaker Turner: "I think we ought to close the verification at this..."

Black: "Let me...just one moment...let me...let me first of all,

Mr. Speaker, let me apologize..."

Speaker Turner: "Mr...Mr. Black, let us close the ver...let's close the roll call if you... Representative Parke, are you finished?"

Parke: "Representative...Representative Stroger, please?"

Speaker Turner: "He's in his seat."

Parke: "Representative Monroe Flinn?"

Speaker Turner: "In his chair."

Parke: "Representative Hicks?"

Speaker Turner: "Representative Schoen... I didn't...would you
repeat that?"

Parke: "Representative Hicks?"

Speaker Turner: "He's in his chair."

Parke: "Representative Deering?"

Deering: "In his chair."

Parke: "Could...could the Chair recognize Representative J.

Ackerman? I think he wants to clarify something."

Speaker Turner: "Are there any further...do you have any further...any further questions?"

Parke: "Yes, we do. Could the Chair recognize Representative Ackerman? He's trying to..."

Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman from Tazewell, Representative Ackerman, for what purpose do you rise?"

Ackerman: "Please record me as 'present'."

51st Legislative Day

April 28, 1993

Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman wishes to be recorded as 'present'. Any further questions, Representative Parke?"

Parke: "Representative Black, be recognized please?"

Speaker Turner: "Are you finished with the verification?"

Parke: "No, we are not. Representative Hawkins?"

- Speaker Turner: "Representative Hawkins is voted 'present'.

 Representative Schoenberg wants... Do you have any further changes? Any further questions? Any further questions,

 Representative Parke?"
- Parke: "We appreciate the courtesy of the chamber for allowing me this verification. I am finished. Thank you."
- Speaker Turner: "Thank you. On this question, there are 61 voting 'yes', 35 voting 'no'.... This question...this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Stephens. Representative... The Gentleman from Madison."
- Stephens: "Oh, Mr. Speaker, I...I do not appreciate not being recognized in a timely manner, and...I mean...you clearly had eye contact, we looked at each other, you knew my light was on, the roll call was open and I wish to discuss that with you, and I...I'm sorry, Sir, that you chose to abuse the rights of the Chair."
- Speaker Turner: "Representative...what question... Do you have any further questions? The Gentleman from Vermilion, Representative Black."
- Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I trust that...and I hope you will accept my apology for my outburst, Mr. Speaker, and I'll apologize to the Members of this Body as well. I don't appreciate being referred to as a Member of a gang, but that's all right. I'll accept that. All I was attempting to do was to call the Chair's attention to Rule 60, which I think was violated, but the Chair probably

51st Legislative Day

April 28, 1993

wouldn't have agreed. You know sometimes, Mr. Speaker, when you are in the minority and you and I should have a better understanding of that fact than any two people on this floor, you can get rather upset when your rules are violated; you are not given an ample opportunity to ask questions; you are not given an ample opportunity to see that the rules are enforced, and just now...just now, Mr. Speaker, you knew...you knew, it was no secret to the Chair, that there were people seeking recognition and you knew probably the reason they were seeking recognition."

Speaker Turner: "Representative, there are lights still flashing at this point and I do not know the reason that there were people seeking recognition of the Chair. We were in the middle of a verification. Representative Parke said he was completed with the verification and we closed that question. There are four lights on the right side of the aisle, meaning on the Democratic side of the aisle, that are flashing at this very moment, and I do not have any idea what they are flashing for, but I thought it was proper that we close the question that was before us at that time, which was House Bill 2207."

Black: "Well, I guess our fundamental disagreement would be that I think the vote was properly closed at 59 and that will just simply be a disagreement. I do express my apologies to you, Sir, for disagreeing with you in a disagreeable fashion. I don't like to do that, but there are times when I truly feel that the people on my side of the aisle are taken advantage of and that their rights are simply grossly and unfairly and unnecessarily. You have the votes. You don't need to do that to us. You don't need to use a heavy hand in the Chair. You have the Majority vote and 90% of the time, we will go along with you, we will cooperate with

· 5- 1

51st Legislative Day

April 28, 1993

you, we will work with you; but doggone it, in all due respect to you, Sir, and all due respect to the Members of this chamber, when we feel our rights are simply being trampled on and ignored, by a heavy-handedness...you don't have to use, given your Majority in this chamber, I...I don't know what recourse I can do other than let you know of my displeasure."

Speaker Turner: "Representative..."

Black: "I again, Sir, apologize for my actions to you. You know that they weren't meant to you personally, but it was meant to the process."

Speaker Turner: "Representative..."

Black: "But when if I feel the process is abused, I will continue to speak out."

Speaker Turner: "Representative, your comments are well taken, and I think you know that I am one who certainly does not agree with abusing Members' rights, and if I abused your rights or any of the Members here in the Assembly, I, too, apologize. Representative McPike, in the Chair."

Speaker McPike: "House Bill 1081, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 1081, a Bill for an Act amending the Child Care Act of 1969. Second Reading of the Bill.

Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. No Motions filed.

Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Ronen."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Ronen."

Ronen: "Thank you, Speaker and Members of the House. This Amendment says, 'for purposes of this section the term 'church' does not include the Branch Dividians.' We're making this Amendment to underscore what we believe to be a very, very serious problem with this Bill. This Bill is bad for children. Children will be at greater risk of being injured or killed or ...for an illness or disease as

51st Legislative Day

April 28, 1993

a result of this Bill. Children will be at greater risk of abuse. Our youngest and most vulnerable children will not receive the special attention they need. This Bill is unnecessary. I raise this Amendment to bring attention from everybody in this chamber that..."

Speaker McPike: "Does anyone stand in opposition to this
Amendment? The question is, 'Shall Amendment #2 be
adopted?' All in favor say 'aye'; opposed, 'no'. The
'ayes' have it, and the Amendment was adopted. Further
Amendments?"

Clerk Rossi: "Amendment #3, offered by Representative Phelps."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Phelps."

Phelps: "Withdraw Amendment 3."

Speaker McPike: "The Gentleman withdraws the Amendment. Further
Amendments?"

Clerk Rossi: "Floor Amendment #4, offered by Representative Phelps."

Speaker McPike: "Mr. Phelps."

you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Phelps: "Thank House. This is an attempt to make a Bill much more acceptable, hopefully, in the eyes of the opposition. The Amendment, actually makes part of the ministry of church as described in the Federal Internal Revenue Code, those churches without government aid provided they still have to meet the...the state health the...that safety and fire standards are maintained if they are without federal aid or any government assistance. A church that ministers daily to children under the age with three shall cause a criminal background investigation to be conducted by the State Police on every person who works at the day-care program. The criminal background investigation shall determine if the persons being

51st Legislative Day

April 28, 1993

investigated has committed, have committed any of the following offenses and there is a long list of offenses which covers most of the offenses under Section 11; 1519; 2020; 21; Section 1213, on down. Everything you can imagine and I can name a few if you'd like, but I'll wait for questions along with that. Also, it covers that if a church does not cause this criminal background check or investigation to be conducted who works at the daily program for children under the age of three, the church shall provide a disclosure statement to the parent or legal quardianment of each child enrolled or to be enrolled in the daily program. So, before a church begins operating a daily program for children under the age of three, they shall notify the Office of the State Fire Marshal, who shall conduct an inspection of the premises in accordance with the 1985 Life Safety Code, and the Office of the Fire Marshal shall conduct an annual inspection of the premises of each church operated daily for children under the age of three. Also, the State Fire Marshal shall issue Certificate of Compliance to each church daily program for children under the age of three that meets the applicable standards and the church, of course, shall display the certificate in a conspicuous place on the premises. actually we've outlined some regulations that have been compromised and we would appreciate a Roll Call Vote and support on this. I'd be happy to answer questions."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Ronen, on the adoption of Amendment #4. Rep...Miss Ronen. Ronen."

Ronen: "Will the...will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker McPike: "Yes, he will."

Ronen: "...This Amendment cites a series of criminal background

51st Legislative Day

April 28, 1993

checks to be performed only on programs serving children under three; is that correct?"

Phelps: "Yes."

Ronen: "What about...children over three and those programs?"

Phelps: "Does not cover that because that has been most of the opposition of the children under three."

Ronen: "That's...I would...I would say that...that's not the case though, whether a child is two...two years old, three years old, four years old, I think we would still be as concerned with the safety for that child. I think this is a flaw. This Amendment allows exempt facilities to opt not to have checks performed by notifying the parents of that decision. Is that true?"

Phelps: "I don't guess I got all your question. Say that one more time?"

Ronen: "Pardon me?"

Phelps: "Say that one more time."

Ronen: "This Amendment would allow exempt facilities to opt not to have checks performed by notifying the parents of the decision, so that there would be leeway not to do these checks by just saying to parents, 'We're not going to'."

Phelps: "Yes, submit a written verification of that fact."

Ronen: "...I think...this still places the children at risk. It doesn't seem to be a fair protection. I would also ask if this requirement would preempt home rule in the City of Chicago?"

Phelps: "That could be a ruling, I guess, of the Chair."

Ronen: "Yeah, it's...in addition the objection of which basic standards will be met. We're talking about applicable standards, but what are...how are we to determine what standards are applicable; and, more importantly, who will enforce those standards? I think this Amendment, while I

51st Legislative Day

April 28, 1993

appreciate the Sponsor's attempt to make this a better Bill, I think we still have a long way to go to correct the major...major deficiencies in House Bill 1081."

Speaker McPike: "Mr. Lang."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. rise in opposition to Floor Amendment #4. I understand that the Sponsors are attempting in good faith to make terrible Bill better; but, in my view, although they've tried to do that, they've failed. This Bill will allow these church day-care centers not to provide background The Bill goes on...the Bill discusses if criminal background investigation is not initiated, church must provide a disclosure statement to the parent or Well, that's not sufficient. Most parents and quardian. guardians who put their children in day-care centers don't opportunity to go looking around and there is a shortage of day-care centers. How far from home go to find one where there...there is a good background check and where they know that the people working at those day-care centers are, in fact, free from a background that...they should be free from? Not too long ago, Governor Thompson vetoed similar legislation and he said the following, 'When a religious organization chooses to enter into the arena of public service, then that service is subject to the same examination of others who venture into public service'. It's just that simple. safeguarding of our children should be paramount. So we've had many Bills on the flow of this House on these issues. Children must be safe. They must be safe in their day-care centers. They must be safe in schools, and despite the fact that the Sponsors have tried to make a bad Bill better, they have not been successful. I would recommend

51st Legislative Day

April 28, 1993

'no' votes."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Ronen, for what reason do you rise?"

Ronen: "Yes, yes, Speaker. I had asked before, maybe I didn't make it clear, for a parliamentary inquiry as to whether this Amendment preempts home rule powers?"

Speaker McPike: "Representative Ronen, that question only comes into play on Third Reading. The adoption of the Amendment is a simple majority."

Ronen: "Could we request a fiscal note?"

Speaker McPike: "Well, you can file that up here. You can request a fiscal note. Just come to the well and file a request for a fiscal note. On the Amendment, Representative Churchill."

Churchill: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. stand in support of Representative Phelp's Amendment, because I think it...it puts the Bill in a final form which should deserve a favorable vote by this House. There have been a lot of people who have questioned this Bill and questioned whether or not there are built-in protections that will help protect the safety of the children who are in the day-care centers that are provided in the church setting, and...there was a question in terms of what kind of churches could do this in the committee. This Amendment defines those churches, as 503(c)3, designees, SO that...that eliminates non-conforming churches. There were questions in regards to the prior records of people lat were going to be in the day-care centers and the Bill calls for criminal background checks or for the notice provision so that people know whether or not somebody is...has been checked or not. There are who questioned immunation...immunization people

51st Legislative Day

April 28, 1993

requirements; the Department of Public Health has an immunization code. I believe, the churches are required to make sure that every child in every facility is immunized correctly."

Speaker McPike: "Mr. Churchill, are you talking to the Bill or the Amendment?"

Churchill: "The Amendment."

Speaker McPike: "All right."

Churchill: "The Amendment requires an inspection by the State Fire Marshal for those programs under the age of three, which is made in compliance with the Life Safety Code. If you look at the Life Safety Code, you see that there provisions regarding staff to client ratios. I think Representative Phelps has done a wonderful job in trying to cover all of the potential problems in this Amendment. I think the Bill is in a position, once amended, that it should deserve a favorable vote of the people of this House. I stand in support."

Speaker McPike: "The question is, 'Shall Amendment #4 be adopted?' All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'no'. Representative Noland."

Noland: "May I ask a question of the Sponsor?"

Speaker McPike: "No, just explain your vote."

Noland: "No thanks."

Speaker McPike: "Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this Motion, there are 63 'ayes' and 39 'noes', and the Amendment is adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk Rossi: "No further Amendments. A fiscal note, as amended, has been requested on the Bill."

Speaker McPike: "All right, the Bill stays on Second Reading.

Appropriation Bills. We intend to do Second Readings and

- 51st Legislative Day

 April 28, 1993

 Third Readings as we move along. Representative

 Churchill."
- Churchill: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As the announcement had been made that there was a fiscal note request made, I was going to make a Motion that there be a ruling that the fiscal note be inapplicable."
- Speaker McPike: "No, the Chair would not so rule. All right,
 House Bill 848."
- Churchill: "Put in the form of a Motion for a vote by the Body."
- Speaker McPike: "House Bill 848. Mr. Clerk. These Bills have all been read a second time. (House Bill) 848. Are there any Amendments?"
- Clerk Rossi: "Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representatives

 Steczo and Ryder."
- Speaker McPike: "Floor Amendment #1, Mr. Steczo."
- Steczo: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. This is the appropriation for the Illinois Supreme Court and, as introduced, this Amendment represents a reduction of \$8,457,000 from the...from the appropriation, as introduced. I'd move for its adoption."
- Speaker McPike: "Mr. Ryder, on the Amendment."
- Ryder: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. These are agreed reductions suggested by the Supreme Court. I compliment the Supreme Court for cooperating. I move its adoption. Thank you."
- Speaker McPike: "The question is, 'Shall Amendment #1 be adopted?' All in favor say 'aye'; opposed, 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, and the Amendment is adopted. Further
- Clerk Rossi: "No further Amendments."
- Speaker McPike: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 848, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the Supreme Court. Third Reading of the

51st Legislative Day

April 28, 1993

Bill."

Speaker McPike: "The question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this Motion, there is lll 'ayes' and l 'no'. House Bill 848, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 917. The Bill's been read a second time. Mr. Clerk, are there any Amendments?"

Clerk Rossi: "Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Hoeft."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Hoeft."

Hoeft: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to amend the request for this budget for this to reflect two different changes: The first of these is a request to take the state board request of a 5.9% increase; the state aid increase in the State of Illinois this year will be 2.2%. It seems to me somewhat of a conflict to have our agency increase its budget by 5.9% or basically 250% more than we're giving to our districts. I would like to take the \$1,100,000 that would be saved if we brought the state aid, excuse me, the state board's budget down to the same percentages as state aid, excuse me, as the school districts are getting."

Speaker McPike: "All right; and, on the Amendment, Mr. Dunn."

Dunn: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House.

I rise to make a generic comment which is an annual frustration of mine. We speak about budgets which are reduced below the level of introduction and to be business-like, what we should be doing is comparing of budget levels to the estimated actual expenditures for the previous year. That's the way it is done in the private business world and we should do the same here. I renew

51st Legislative Day

- April 28, 1993
- $\ensuremath{\mathsf{my...}}$ I just make the point, and let's proceed with these Bills."
- Speaker McPike: "The question is, 'Shall Amendment #2 be adopted?

 All in favor say 'aye'; opposed, 'no'. The 'ayes' have it.

 The Amendment is adopted. Further Amendments?"
- Clerk Rossi: "Floor Amendment #3, offered by Representative Weaver."
- Speaker McPike: "Representative Weaver."
- Weaver: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Amendment #3 transfers \$1,165,000 GRF from the state boards operation budget to state general state aid. It also transfers a \$1 million GRF to the educational service centers to the Teachers Retirement fund. Ιt also transfers \$5,260...16,300 GRF from bilingual education programs to the Residential Services Authority, early intervention and preschool programs. I'11 be happy to answer questions."
- Speaker McPike: "The question is, 'Shall Amendment #2...Amendment
 #3 be adopted?' All in favor say 'aye'; opposed, 'no'.

 The 'ayes' have it, and the Amendment is adopted. Further

 Amendments?"
- Clerk Rossi: "Floor Amendment #4, offered by Representative Edley."
- Speaker McPike: "Mr. Edley."
- Edley: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the General Assembly. Amendment #4, comes the...becomes the Bill. It appropriates \$4,446,740,100 to the State Board of Education. It represents a doubling of the Governor's recommended level to an increase of \$220 million. It represents a \$120 million increase in general state aid and a \$20 million increase in preschool, a \$20 million increase in the teachers retirement funds and a \$60 million increase

51st Legislative Day

April 28, 1993

in categoricals and other...appropriations to the state board, and I would urge a 'aye' vote."

Speaker McPike: "On the Amendment, Representative Ryder."

Ryder: "Thank you. Will the Sponsor yield for a question or two?"

Speaker McPike: "Yes, he will."

Ryder: "Representative, you're adding a \$110 million over the Governor's level to education; most of it going to downstate schools, through the school aid formula. What is the source of this magical \$110 million?"

Edley: "Well, as you know, Representative Ryder, that the \$110 million is...is distributed among all schools in the state. The source of it is going to be through cuts in the operations of state government. We have cuts in the budget that will be presented here later today plus the cuts that the Senate has already made and hopefully we can make more."

Ryder: "Representative, you don't seriously ask this House to consider the cuts that you are suggesting as anything other than a device to require the budgets to return to the House."

Edley: "I...I'm very serious about it. I wish that we could provide more money for education. This will not make a significant impact on...on the property tax state funding ratio, but it will allow us to at least reverse the decline in the percentage of state funding for our grade schools and high schools, unlike the Governor's proposal which would actually, once again, find the state reducing their percentage of...of school funding."

Ryder: "To the Amendment, Mr. Speaker. The cuts that the Gentleman has just discussed don't even come close to \$110 million. They're far, far less than \$110 million. The

51st Legislative Day

April 28, 1993

money that he's spending is phony, baloney money. The majority of that money is in the school aid formula. I suppose if the school aid formula would be helpful to you given the fact that you get a lot of it and you like to spend phony, baloney money, you might be in support of this. For those of us who think the budget ought to be balanced, it doesn't quite make sense and, of course, if you're folks that don't receive under the school aid formula, perhaps you might not be in favor of it as well."

Speaker McPike: "On the Amendment, Mr. Weaver."

Weaver: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A brief question of the Sponsor?"

Speaker McPike: "Yes."

Weaver: "Representative, as long as you are adding \$110 million to the...to the education budget, why didn't we go one step further and ad \$1.4 billion as recommended by the task force on educational finance?"

Edley: "\$One point four billion?"

Weaver: "Billion."

Edley: "Right. Well, I...I certainly would like to have...have accommodated the. task force recommendation; unfortunately the Governor is unwilling to provide the means necessary to fund that. I think that the \$110 million is reasonable. Though, I think, would you look at a previous roll call here last week, some Members on that side of the aisle voted for a \$158 million reduction in taxes for...for manufacturers in businesses throughout this I opposed that reduction; hopefully, the Governor will oppose it as well. I think that schools should be the state's top priority. I think the voters of this state have demonstrated time and time again they want education the state's top priority, and I am willing to make the cuts

Tage Sength

51st Legislative Day

April 28, 1993

and make the sacrifices to ensure that education and our school children receive the kind of education that they need to compete in the 21st century and this is a step. It is a positive step. It's twice what the Governor had...had suggested, and I think it is reasonable to expect that it can be done.

Weaver: "Well, Mr. Speaker, to the...to the Amendment. I...while
I don't disagree with the Sponsor's intent, as matter of
fact I would like to put as much money into education as
the task force recommended; however, as Mr. Ryder has
already stated, the \$110 million is as out of reach as the
\$1.4 billion is because it's simply an unrealistic figure.
The numbers are not there. The cuts that we've identified
amount to about \$50 million, which leaves us still \$60
million short of what the Sponsor of this Amendment would
like to do. A Sponsor, I might mention, who has never
voted for the surcharge to provide money for education, so
I would...I would expect that perhaps one of these days
we're gonna have to put our money where our mouth is."

Speaker McPike: "Mr. Edley, to close."

Edley: "Did I... I did vote for the surcharge in 1990, I think when it was renewed. Ι simply did not vote for the property tax component of it. I think education should this state's priorities. There are ways to do that, but it takes executive leadership on this question. Where are we going to find the money to fund our schools? Here a couple days ago, you had the property tax phony-baloney property tax proposal. The only way to havetrue property tax relief is for the state to meet its commitment to funding our schools. This is twice what the Governor had proposed. It is doable, and I would urge an 'aye' vote."

51st Legislative Day

April 28, 1993

- Speaker McPike: "The question is, 'Shall Amendment #4 be adopted?' All in favor say 'aye'; opposed, 'no'. The 'ayes' have it and the Amendment is adopted. Further Amendments?"
- Clerk Rossi: "Floor Amendment #5, offered by Representative Edley."
- Speaker McPike: "Mr. Edley."
- Edley: "Representative... Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the General Assembly. Amendment #5 corrects a couple of technical errors in Amendment 4, and I would urge an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker McPike: "The question is, 'Shall Amendment #5 be adopted?' All in favor say 'aye'; opposed, 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, and the Amendment is adopted. Further Amendments?"
- Clerk Rossi: "Floor Amendment #6, offered by Representative Weaver."
- Speaker McPike: "Is the Amendment printed? Yes, Mr. Weaver."
- Weaver: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. ...Because the previous Amendments had removed the transfer from GRF operations of the State Board of Education, this Amendment transfers that money, once again, \$1,165,000 from state board operations to the general state aid formula. I'd be happy to answer any questions."
- Speaker McPike: "The question is, 'Shall Amendment #6 be adopted?' Mr. Edley."
- Edley: "Yes, I have a question for the Sponsor."
- Speaker McPike: "Yes."
- Edley: "Do you have a breakout of what the consequences of this will be on...on...on the state board's programs?"
- Weaver: "These...these are our estimates of the savings that would occur with unfilled positions and some other savings

51st Legislative Day

April 28, 1993

within the operational line of SBE."

Edley: "Well, I certainly congratulate..."

Weaver: "Yeah, we're cutting bureaucracy."

Edley: "Yeah, I congratulate the Sponsor on finding a \$1 million and...and, but it doesn't really compare much with we found of \$110 million, but..."

Weaver: "But this is...is...."

Edley: "I don't have any question of this..."

Speaker McPike: "The question is, 'Shall Amendment #6 be adopted?' All in favor say 'aye'; opposed, 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, and the Amendment is adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk Rossi: "No further Amendments."

Speaker McPike: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 917, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the State Board of Education. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Steczo."

Steczo: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This...is House Bill 917 does make the appropriation for the State Board of Education.

It includes the additional money that Representative Edley and the Appropriations Committee found, and I would ask for its passage."

Speaker McPike: "Mr. Weaver, on the passage of the Bill."

Weaver: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Just a brief question of the Sponsor. With as convoluted as this Bill has now become with all the Amendments on it, would you hazard a guess as to the chances of it coming bear to this chamber for another vote?"

Steczo: "All I know is, Mr. Weaver, that Representative Edley has worked day and night trying to find the level that was appropriate that we could pass out of this House and feel

51st Legislative Day

April 28, 1993

safe in the fact that the Governor could sign it. So, we're hoping that this Bill does not come back, unless..."

Weaver: "Well..."

Steczo: "There is more money that we have found."

Weaver: "I...I appreciate his day and night efforts; obviously, it didn't take us quite that long to figure out that..."

Steczo: "He found \$110..."

Weaver: "Well, \$110 was somewhere in the air, but...so, we could advise our targets to go ahead and vote on this Bill, because they'll probably see it again to vote on it once more. Is that correct?"

Steczo: "We hope that's not the case, but they should vote for it anyway."

Weaver: "I agree."

Speaker McPike: "The question is, 'Shall 917 pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? Representative Flowers. No, she did not want to speak. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this Motion, there are 106 'ayes' and 3 'noes'. House Bill 917, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1243 has been read a second time. Are there any Amendments, Mr. Clerk?"

Clerk Rossi: "Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Hannig."

Speaker McPike: "Mr. Hannig withdraws the Amendment. Further Amendments?"

Clerk Rossi: "Floor Amendment #3, offered by Representative Balanoff."

Speaker McPike: "Mr. Balanoff, you withdraw that Amendment? Is that correct? Yes, the Gentleman withdraws the Amendment.

51st Legislative Day

April 28, 1993

Further Amendments?"

Clerk Rossi: "Floor Amendment #4, offered by Representative Hannig."

Speaker McPike: "Mr. Hannig."

Hannig: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. just passed an Amendment that appropriated about \$110 million for the general state aid for our public above and beyond what the Governor introduced. question was asked on that other side of the aisle, 'Where do we find the money?' Well, this series of Amendments begins finding that money. Now we have to understand that about half of the budget, even more than half of the budget, in terms of dollars is in the Senate and it came over, but we've made an effort here in the House to take those House Bills that we had and find at least \$50 million so that we could say that we can put that \$110 million on to the state aid budget. So now, this...these Amendments are how we begin to find the money. This series of Roll Call Votes will determine where your priorities really lie. So, let me basically underline and outline the cuts in this Amendment #3. For Central Development...for Capitol Development Board, for the operations only, we propose cutting \$219,000; CMS, \$25 million; Civil Service \$2.8; Educational Labor Relations Board, \$452; Property Tax Appeal Board, \$210,000; Revenue, \$5,181,000; State and Local Labor Relations Board, \$519,000. This begins the process of finding the money. I'd be happy to answer any details as to the specialist, and I'd move for adoption of Amendment #4."

Speaker McPike: "And, on that Motion, Mr. Skinner."

Skinner: "Could you tell me where the \$25 million in CMS is disappearing from?"

51st Legislative Day

April 28, 1993

Hannig: "Yes, Representative, I'd be happy to. The biggest part of that reduction is \$21 million that was added to the supplemental budget in the Senate for State Employees Health Insurance. Ιn fact when we passed that supplemental, we were \$21 million over the Governor's recommended level. We have taken \$21 million of this fiscal years proposal, so that when we come to June 30 of 1994, we will still be at the Governor's target. So, they got \$21 to much last year, or fis...FY' 93; we're suggesting \$21 million less in FY '94. The rest comes from operations, about \$3 million."

Skinner: "Well, Mr. Chairman, it may be the case that General Assembly Members are treated differently from other state retired state employees and employees, mother-in-law, who is a retired state employee, has bills outstanding for well over a year. It seems to me this is an inappropriate place to take money, especially district such as yours, which has many, many more state employees than my own. I would, also, rise in opposition because of the cut in the State Property Tax Appeal Board. I hold property tax appeal sessions where I teach my constituents how to appeal assessments of the State Property Tax Appeal Board (with the help of a lawyer, course), and frankly, the State Property Tax Appeal Board appears to be a little behind the curve on being able give a timely response. If you want your constituents to have to wait longer for tax rebates as a result of lower property tax - sessments, you certainly ought to vote for this Amendment. But, if not, you ought to vote 'no'."

Speaker McPike: "Mr. Olson. Representative Olson."

Olson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I want to point out that, yes, there are reductions in here, in these various agencies as

51st Legislative Day

April 28, 1993

eluded to by Representative Hannig. Some of these are rather severe. Representative Skinner has addressed the group health insurance issue of \$21 million. Also, in a couple of these agencies, there's 50% pay cuts, personnel line-item cuts for merit comp positions, and there's also 50% cuts for rental contracts. Now, rental contracts, if we do not get to the original line, we're looking at six months of business, but I guess if you're gonna lay off half of your employees, you don't have to keep the bud...the building for the rest of the year either, so just wanted to point these things out to you."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Ryder."

"Thank you. Just briefly to the representations made Rvder: Representative Hannig on this Amendment. The Amendments that you are sponsoring have two purposes. let...allow that there may be some small savings within here and we're happy to join you on those savings in government, but to suggest that making cuts in the State Group Health Insurance or in some of the other Amendments where you cut rents by half, those are...those are not cuts of...in state government, those are cuts requiring the Senate to amend the Bills, so you send them back here. That's the reason those cuts are there. You know that and I know that. But, to somehow suggest that all of those cuts financed \$110 million phony-baloney money for state govern...for education is simply not true and those of who worked in the appropriations, know that to be the case. On hore of to goodness savings, we're right there. We know that we've gotta make some changes in the state government budget and we're glad to do it, but don't suggest on this Bill or any of the other Bills that follow that all those cuts that you are making are true cuts. They are

51st Legislative Day

April 28, 1993

not; they are made to get this Bill to the Senate and back here with a Senate Amendment. That's what those cuts are for."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Ryder. I'm sorry, Representative Edley."

Edley: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Let me just...clarify that are increasing the State Health Insurance appropriation by almost \$140 million. The state employees are going to be getting a larger increase in state appropriated funds over FY '93 original appropriation than we're funding for schools. So, I don't think it's inappropriate to...to bring that level of appropriation down to what the Governor originally requested. As far as the rents are concerned, Governor Edgar has said repeatedly that he downsized state government; that he has reduced state employees; and if that is truly the case, then he needs less office space. So, I would suggest that the Governor and the people at CMS go through their leases and see and renegotiate them and consolidate them. If we have fewer state employees, we need...we need fewer offices and I would anticipate that they could cut those leases at least 15% and report back to us in the Veto Session with...with the bloated leases shrunk down to where they should be. You know, it's ironic, it's ironic that our...that our colleagues across the aisle are always talking about letting the market determine how we allocate resources and yet...and yet only 3% of the state's leases are bid. Thety-seven percent of the state's leases are negotiated. The free market is great; I'm a big supporter of it I'm...and I'm...bemused that the opposition is opposed...opposed to the free market, when the free market is the best allocator of resources. Let's take these state

51st Legislative Day

- April 28, 1993
- leases out, renegotiate them, put some of them up for bid and see if we can't save the taxpayers some money."
- Speaker McPike: "The question is, 'Shall Amendment #4 be adopted?' All in favor say 'aye'; opposed, 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, and the Amendment is adopted. Further Amendments?"
- Clerk Rossi: "Floor Amendment #5, offered by Representative Balanoff."
- Speaker McPike: "Representative Balanoff."
- Balanoff: "Amendment #5 would be to provide \$2,5 million to the
 City of Chicago for the building of a Jeffery Manor Branch
 Library to serve the underserved the communities of Jeffrey
 Manor, Pilhill, Pulman, South Deering and all surrounding
 areas, and I move for its adoption."
- Speaker McPike: "The question is, 'Shall Amendment #5 be adopted?' All in favor say 'aye'; opposed, 'no'. The 'noes' have it, and the Amendment is defeated. Further Amendments?"
- Clerk Rossi: "No further Amendments."
- Speaker McPike: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 1243, a Bill for an Act making appropriations and reappropriations to various government service agencies. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker McPike: "Representative Ryder or Rep.., whoever wants to answer it. Representative Olson, please. Representative Olson?"
- Olson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I simply move for the passage of this appropriation Bill 1243."
- Speaker McPike: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 1243 pass?'

 All those in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish?

 The Clerk will take the record. On this Motion, there is

51st Legislative Day

April 28, 1993

106 'ayes' and 1 'no'; and House Bill 1243, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1244 has been read a second time. Mr. Clerk, are there any Amendments?"

Clerk Rossi: "Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Hannig."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Hannig."

Hannig: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. Again, this is a series of cuts that we provided to the Members so that we can fund the education increases. The first one is for the Department of Conservation of \$3 million. In this proposed cut, we have not cut any money from the division in that agency that deals with state parks except that we've eliminated merit comp raises for the management people. All of the rest of the cuts go to the various other divisions outside of land management of state parks. We proposed \$423 million for energy and natural resources and, I'm sorry, \$423,000 for energy and natural resources and \$306,000 for mines and minerals, and again there...there would be no cuts in any of the mine safetv inspectors, and I move for the adoption of #... Amendment #2."

Speaker McPike: "And, on...and on that Motion, Representative Olson."

Olson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In response to Representative Hannig, he did mention that merit comp pay raises are eliminated, but he failed to mention that the merit comp personal item line is cut in half and as we alluded to in the last Bill, real property line is reduced by 50% which the department then claims will force it to vacate all office buildings halfway through the year. I don't...I understand the necessity of budget cuts, but I think we

51st Legislative Day

- April 28, 1993
- have to be more practical than we are doing at this particular time, but I think we all also recognize that this is not the final step in the budgeting process."
- Speaker McPike: "The question is, 'Shall Amendment #2 be adopted?' All in favor say 'aye'; opposed, 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, and the Amendment is adopted. Further Amendments?"
- Clerk Rossi: "Floor Amendment #3, offered by Representative Hannig."
- Speaker McPike: "Representative Hannig."
- Hannig: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House.

 This would reduce the budget for the Environmental

 Protection Agency by \$2,699,000 as well as the Pollution

 Control Board by \$388,000, and I'd move for its adoption."
- Speaker McPike: "The question is, 'Shall Amendment #3 be adopted?' All in favor say 'aye'; opposed, 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, and the Amendment is adopted. Further Amendments?"
- Clerk Rossi: "Floor Amendment #4, offered by Representative Hannig."
- Speaker McPike: "Representative Hannig."
- Hannig: "Yes, this appropriates... Mr. Speaker, I think this Representative Novak's Amendment."
- Speaker McPike: "Representative Novak."
- Novak: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House.

 This Amendment simply appropriates \$10,000 to the Will

 County Forest Preserve for a maintenance program that
 they've been continuing for a number of years, for the
 Thorn Creek Nature Preserve and I ask for your support."
- Speaker McPike: "The question is, 'Shall Amendment #4 be adopted?' All in favor say 'aye'; opposed, 'no'. The 'noes' have it, and the Amendment is defeated. Further

51st Legislative Day

April 28, 1993

Amendments?"

Clerk Rossi: "No further Amendments."

Speaker McPike: "Third Reading. House Bill 1245 has been read a second time. Mr. Clerk, are there any Amendments?"

Clerk Rossi: "Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Hannig."

Speaker McPike: "Mr. Hannig."

Hannig: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. This Amendment, Amendment #2 provides for the same type of..."

Speaker McPike: "Sorry."

Hannig: "Cuts that we proposed in the other state budgets. It has to deal with Liquor Control Commission, Banks and Trusts, Financial Institutions, no cuts for Human Rights, Commerce Commission, Racing Board, Industrial Commission, Insurance Professional Regulation, Public Council and Savings and Residential Finance, and, I move for its adoption."

Speaker McPike: "On this Amendment, Representative Olson."

Olson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This reduction Amendment eliminates \$33 million, \$28 million of that is from other funds, it is not General Revenue funds. For instance, in the Commissioner of Banks and Trust, it takes out \$5 million. The Commissioner of Banks and Trust operates on no general revenue funds at all. It is money collected from the banks that they move into to audit. This, again, I don't believe is a practical reduction Amendment, but I understand the purpose here. We'll address these things in a later time."

Speaker McPike: "The question is, 'Shall Amendment #2 be adopted?' All in favor say 'aye'; opposed, 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, and the Amendment is adopted. Further Amendments?"

- 51st Legislative Day April 28, 1993
- Clerk Rossi: "Floor Amendment #3, offered by Representative Hannig."
- Speaker McPike: "Mr. Hannig, do you withdraw the Amendment? Mr. Hannig? Mr. Hannig? Mr. Hannig, Amendment #3."
- Hanniq: "Yeah, withdraw."
- Speaker McPike: "Withdraws Amendment #3. Further Amendments?"
- Clerk Rossi: "Floor Amendment #4, offered by Representative Hannig."
- Speaker McPike: "Mr. Hannig."
- Hannig: "Yes, this is just a technical Amendment, and I move for its adoption."
- Speaker McPike: "The question is, 'Shall Amendment #4 be adopted?' All in favor say 'aye'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, and the Amendment is adopted. Further Amendments?"
- Clerk Rossi: "Floor Amendment #5, offered by Representative Hannig."
- Speaker McPike: "Representative Hannig."
- Hannig: "Yes, Rep... Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the
 House. This restores the appraisal of funds for the
 Department of Professional Regulation which we deleted
 previously in error, and I'd move for its adoption."
- Speaker McPike: "The question is, 'Shall Amendment #5 be adopted?' All in favor say 'aye'; opposed, 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, and the Amendment is adopted. Further Amendments?"
- Clerk Rossi: "No further Amendments."
- Speaker McPike: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 1245, a Bill for an Act making appropriations and reappropriations to various regulatory agencies. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker McPike: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 1245 pass?'

51st Legislative Day

- April 28, 1993
- All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted? Representative Olson."
- Olson: "I was only going to call your attention when you completed this roll call. I think we skipped Third Reading on the last Bill."
- Speaker McPike: "Yes, you're correct. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this Motion, there is 113 'ayes' and 0 'nays'. House Bill 1245, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1244, Mr. Clerk, Third Reading, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 1244, a Bill for an Act making appropriations and reappropriations to var...various environmental agencies. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker McPike: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 1244 pass?'

 All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish?

 The Clerk will take the record. On this Motion, there is 107 'ayes' and 4 'noes'; and House Bill 1244, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1246 is on Second Reading. Mr. Clerk, any Amendments?"
- Clerk Rossi: "Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Saltsman."
- Speaker McPike: "Representative Saltsman."
- Saltsman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Floor Amendment #2, this
 Amendment also has a series of cuts for the following
 agencies: the Criminal Justice Information Amendmenty, the
 Emergency Management Agency, Police Training Board,
 Military Affairs, Nuclear Safety, Prisoner Review Board,
 State Fire Marshals' Offer...Office, State Police, Office
 of the State Police, State Police Merit Board. At that,

51st Legislative Day

April 28, 1993

most of these cuts have been in our merit comp hiring programs," and, at that, I ask for passage of this Amendment."

Speaker McPike: "And, on that Motion, Representative Tenhouse."

Tenhouse: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker McPike: "Yes, he will."

Tenhouse: "Could you explain a little bit here as far as implications? One of the areas I'm looking at in particular, Representative Saltsman, how is this going to impact on the State Police?"

Saltsman: "Can I hear that again?"

Tenhouse: "How's this going to impact on the State Police budget?"

Saltsman: "It will not bother any of the troopers or any of the people out in the field operations and it will..."

Tenhouse: "Well, I'm just looking here at the tentative figures you're talking about eliminating..."

Saltsman: "Yes, it reflects a \$1,873,000, a 50% reduction of 44 merit compensation positions in the Administration Division; contractual services reduces a \$1,684,600; on rental and road property a reduction of 50% reduction in office facilities and leased parking spaces, and it don't affect any of our troopers in the state."

Tenhouse: "One of the things I've noticed in here, where are we going to put the troopers, are they going to sit in their police cars out in the street? Because we're talking about cutting the Isles Park lease, South Kirnelease in Chicago, Collinsville lease, Macomb lease by half. How are we going to keep these facilities open if we are only gonna pay half of the rent?"

Saltsman: "Yes, that's on a six months basis and what this is

51st Legislative Day

April 28, 1993

for, Representative Tenhouse, is we're asking CMS and our people in transportation to go back and renegotiate the rent and..."

Tenhouse: "So, you're planning on coming in with a supplemental then, later on, Representative..."

Saltsman: "We have to in six months. Yes."

Tenhouse: "Okay, so that's your intent, so basically, we're still going to be looking at..."

Saltsman: "Yes, there's plenty of vacant property out there and we think that we can get better prices on rent now if we put it on a bid system and some of these places that do that have strangled the Governor. You know our Governor got strangled with...with a program when he came into office of leased space that had no-bid items. There was a very small percentage of...of bids on anything that went out of here and I think this is a favor for the Governor for us to do this, because I think he'd like to dump some of these people that he got strapped around his neck when he came into office."

Tenhouse: "Well, I don't know whether he will look on it quite
that same way or not, but that will be a topic for
discussion later, but these 68 merit comp employees, how
are they going to impact on delivery of service as far as
the State Police is concerned?"

Saltsman: "Well, everything is computerized now and we've got a very good director and I'm sure he can find a way."

Tenhouse: "One of the issues that comes up for those of us in downstate is the State Fire "In I's Office and especially in their efforts as far as underground storage tank funds. We're...we're short there all along. I notice that I've got a cut here as well; what's...what's the basis for that under the State Fire Marshal's office, Representative?"

51st Legislative Day

April 28, 1993

Saltsman: "That'll be manageable under the amount of money that they end up when these negotiations are over, so that...there's some important things here that might have got by our eye and our view as far as our staff and I am concerned and that's still negotiable."

Tenhouse: "Could you explain?"

Saltsman: "Right now, I'd rather come up than go down again."

Tenhouse: "And as a former professional firefighter, I...could you explain, I...the Fire Prevention Fund?"

Saltsman: "I understand, Rep..."

Tenhouse: "What are those funds used for?"

Saltsman: "Oh, they're used for training for student education, they're used for...inspections and different things of the nature and the fire training academies and so on, and we might have a little bureaucracy there that we don't need."

Tenhouse: "...The \$926,000, what will that leave in the fire prevention fund for our efforts to educate young people?"

Saltsman: "Can you ask that question again?"

Tenhouse: "What will be left in the fund, the fire prevention fund, once we eliminate \$926,000?"

Saltsman: "I don't have the exact total amount right now."

Tenhouse: "Well, well thank..."

Saltsman: "Enough to keep it in operation."

Tenhouse: "Well, and I appreciate your...forthright frankness there as far as explaining it, Representative, but to the Amendment. I would certainly look upon this with some concern, especially from a public safety standpoint. I realize that as we work at these budget lines, some of these are going to be extremely difficult, but...especially the cuts in the Department of the State Police could have a real adverse effect and impact on those of us in downstate."

51st Legislative Day

April 28, 1993

- Speaker McPike: "The question is, 'Shall Amendment #2 be adopted?' All in favor say 'aye'; opposed, 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, and the Amendment is adopted. Further Amendments?"
- Clerk Rossi: "Floor Amendment #3, offered by Representative Saltsman."
- Speaker McPike: "Mr. Saltsman."
- Saltsman: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is just a technical Amendment, and I ask for its passage."
- Speaker McPike: "The question is, 'Shall Amendment #3 be adopted?' All in favor say 'aye'; opposed, 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, and the Amendment is adopted. Further Amendments?"
- Clerk Rossi: "No further Amendments."
- Speaker McPike: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 1246, a Bill for an Act making appropriations and reappropriations to various public safety agencies. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker McPike: "The question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this Motion, there are 96 'ayes' and 5 'noes'. House Bill 1246, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1247. The Bill's been read a second time. Mr. Clerk, are there any Amendments?"
- Clerk Rossi: "Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Pankau."
- Speaker McPike: "Representative Pankau. Mr. Clerk, has Amendment #10 on this Bill been printed? Yes. Proceed, Representative."
- Pankau: "Then I ask to withdraw Amendment 2."

51st Legislative Day

April 28, 1993

Speaker McPike: "The Lady would... Amendment #10 has been printed. Is that correct? Amendment #2 is withdrawn. Further Amendments?"

Clerk Rossi: "Floor Amendment #3, offered by Representative Saltsman."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Saltsman."

Saltsman: "Yes, thank you. Mr. Speaker, Amendment #3 also has a series of cuts in the Department of Transportation. The operation, a total of \$692,000 that contain a \$157,800, 50% reduction in merit and comp, merit compensation positions; \$260,111 to eliminate overtime in extra help in five vacancies; \$159,000, 50% reduction in rental real property; an additional 3% other contractual items; \$100,000 in equipment reduction in equipment purchase of cars and trucks; \$14,100, 10% reduction in travel and commodities. Also, in the operations and the road fund, 50% reduction department request for new cars and truck replacement; that total package is \$3,433,150. I ask for its passage."

Speaker McPike: "On that Motion, Representative Tenhouse."

Tenhouse: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I guess when we look here we're talking about total cuts. Can we have your attention? We're talking about cuts in the transportation budget of \$784,494,212, \$784 million. I guess the main thing that jumps out at us here, Representative Saltsman, are the cuts in the high rate program cuts for Fiscal year 94? You're talking about a cut in the road fund of \$345,800,000 and construction fund of \$535 million. How is this going to impact on our infrastructure here in the State of Illinois?"

Speaker McPike: "Representative Saltsman."

Saltsman: "Yes, there is not \$784 million worth of cuts here because our road fund appropriation has not been released

51st Legislative Day

April 28, 1993

yet and with their supplemental last week of a \$110 million supplemental, which...which was approval also subtracts; and,...therefore, we are less than that amount."

- Tenhouse: "But, in fact, we're cutting on State Construction

 Account Fund, \$535 million; road fund \$374 million. How

 will that impact?"
- Saltsman: "There hasn't been one penny cut that I know of from the actual road construction brick and mortar program. There hasn't, but there has been some, like I said, in their replacement of vehicle possibly and their road fund hasn't, their formula has not been released yet, so we had a hard time doing this, because we don't usually get this until this time of year and we're a little bit ahead of time of their schedule."
- Tenhouse: "Now our analysis here, that perhaps maybe we're not reading from the same program here, but we looked and we're talking about cutting funds for arterial highways, areas, roadside shelters, rest areas, access parking facilities, bikeways, land acquisition and sign removal and control, junk yard removal and control and preservation of natural beauty and on and on and on. are we talking about here? I quess we are talking about...regardless of how we slice this and dice it, we're still talking about cuts of \$374,329,000 in the road fund, and \$535 million in the state construction account How are we, as a state, when we're bouncin' over these highways all over this state, gonna be able to maintain it without these dollars?"
- Saltsman: "Yes Representative, if you go to page 12 of the Amendment, you'll see where there's \$535,000 there that we put zero in all our district road fund allowances because IDOT does not have the package ready for us yet. We're

51st Legislative Day

April 28, 1993

looking for the...we're lookin' for IDOT to give this to the Senate and for the Senate to put it in when it over there. That'll cover \$500 million of your program right there. You got a bunch of zeroes behind your program; so, therefore, some of this is just the improper timing of us moving our schedule up. IDOT never did give us this program until this time of the year anyhow, and now they just didn't have it ready. We thought it'd be ready Tuesday, they thought they could get it to us and they didn't, so that's part of the program that we could work with later when this Bill comes back. We're waitin' for the Governor, and we're waitin' for IDOT to bring those figures to us."

Tenhouse: "So, what you're saying is, that this is certainly not the final form of the Bill as far as the...your intentions are concerned."

Saltsman: "I think your Republican Senator will send this Bill back. You're gonna have another look at it."

Tenhouse: "One of the things we're looking at here, is that in fact we go ahead with this. How many jobs will be impacted if in fact these dollars aren't restored by our Republican Senate? Any idea?"

Saltsman: "It's hard to guarantee."

. 54.

Tenhouse: "In fact, we're advised that these cuts would amount to a loss of 35,000 construction jobs downstate or all over the State of Illinois, so..."

Saltsman: "Well, with our analysis and what our intent was, was to not mess with the construction road project, and I don't see any cuts in here that will actually do any damage to that; and like I said, I think the Senate in two or three weeks is going to have a lot better chance to fulfill this end of it out when IDOT does come with that final plan for

51st Legislative Day

April 28, 1993

- us. We're a little premature, Representative Tenhouse."
- Tenhouse: "Well, thank you, Representative, and I certainly do appreciate, again, your honesty as far as the fact that you do not intend to be the final form of the Bill, but to the Amendment. I think we need to realize that this just points out one of the concerns that a lot of us are looking at here, is that this is, in fact, we're making a travesty of the entire process...we start talking about making cuts here of almost \$880 million and reasonably we're not going to see those come later on, it's crazy, and especially when we start looking at some of the press releases that are going to be coming out saying that this is a way that we can generate funds to balance the state budget. You know and I know we're gonna have to come up with dollars; otherwise we're gonna be talking about a massive transfer of dollars from transportation funds into the general And I for one, and I think those of us on this revenue. side of the aisle, did not join in that effort. I would urge our Members to oppose this Amendment."
- Speaker McPike: "The question is, 'Shall Amendment #3 be adopted?' All in favor say 'aye', opposed, 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, and the Amendment's adopted. Further Amendments?"
- Clerk Rossi: "Floor Amendment #4, offered by Representative Edley."
- Speaker McPike: "Mr. Edley. Representative Edley. He's here
 Mr. Edley's here. He's always...he's always here."
- Edley: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the General Assembly. Amendment 4 impacts District 6, which is the Springfield Transportation District, and appropriates \$1 for a highway...regional highway project that is quite controversial in my area and reappropriates \$7 million

51st Legislative Day

April 28, 1993

(7)00,000 on the U.S. 67 Highway, and I would urge... This has no impact reduction of road funding throughout the state. It has no impact on those road funds, simply a reallocation of road funds within my region."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Ryder."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I draw your attention to this particular Amendment because this Amendment affects all of us. This Amendment affects all of us. By this Amendment, the Representative is asking that money that has been previously allocated to a road project in another Members district be stopped, and that those dollars be allocated for a project in his own district. This is not a reallocation within his own district guidelines or boundary lines, but rather from one other Member's to his own. I would simply state that money that he is attempting to change as part of the five-year plan of the Department of Transportation, five-year plan that has been approved by this Leqislature each and every year with the appropriations and I would suggest in all probability supported by the Sponsor of this Amendment. It is a bad concept to start this kind of misuse of funds, however laudable, and by the way the purpose that he wants to use 'em is very good, except that when you rob from Peter to pay Paul, all of us may be robbed in the future. A bad concept. I would urge its defeat."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Tenhouse."

Tenhouse: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker McPike: "Yes."

Tenhouse: "Representative, the highway that we're talking about here is the 336 extension from Quincy that eventually'll

51st Legislative Day

April 28, 1993

end up in your home town of Macomb..."

Edley: "Right."

Tenhouse: "Could you explain to me...I guess, what the status would be on some federal demonstration dollars that are currently involved?"

Edley: "They would be on hold for this next year."

Tenhouse: "In fact, when you're talking about the controversial nature of this project, in fact these demonstration projects...this demonstration project dollars were obtained by Congressman Richard Durbin, a Democrat. He got \$5 million for a special demonstration project for the road from Quincy to Carthage and eventually to your home town of Macomb. As we look ahead here, I guess what would be your logic in looking at throwing away \$5 million in federal dollars just to make this transfer?"

Edley: "Well, Representative, you and I share Hancock County. When our school buses can't go down our roads to take their children to school and yet we can appropriate \$40 million to build a highway, I think our...I think the IDOT's transportation priorities are screwed I'm up. not categorically opposed to this highway, I'm simply saying that we have other, more pressing transportation needs and currently, we don't have the funds available for that. what I'm doing is I feel the responsible thing is delaying, a long-term highway project so that we can fund our farm-to-market road needs that are in really serious, serious condition."

Tenhouse: "Mr. Speaker, to the Amendment. I guess the point of it is when we're talking about this particular situation, and, in fact, you're talking about a red herring, Representative Edley, because you're not transferring money into dollars that are going to be used for road

**;

51st Legislative Day

April 28, 1993

maintenance. You're talking about transferring dollars from within a four-lane project in my district into your district, and I think that I would ask for the other Members here on both sides of the aisle to realize the precedent here, because it is important. I mean, would you...now our control...we now have Republican control of the Senate. I have served down here for four years. This is the first time I've seen an instance where we've had a blatant pirate attempt to take dollars out of one district into another simply because of political gain on the part of the individual, and I would rise in strong opposition to this Amendment, and I would ask that Members on both sides would join with me."

Speaker McPike: "All right. Very briefly, Representative Brunsvold."

Brunsvold: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Let me...Representative Ryder was absolutely right. This affects us all. There is a road being built down in Macomb area to Quincy that is costing between \$200 million and \$300 million that serves 60,000 people. That's...Route 67 goes from my town Miland to Representative McPike's town in Alton. That road is heavily used, yet we're building a road with \$200 million to \$300 million for 60,000 people. It just doesn't make any sense, folks. Vote 'aye'."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Olson. Mr. Olson."

Olson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I hope everyone in this chamber has listened to the last three speakers talking against this Amendment. The Department of Transportation annually...the Department of Transportation annually puts out a one-year plan and a five-year plan, and if you've got a road that needs work in your district, talk to 'em, you'll get it in that plan. If Representative Edley is

51st Legislative Day

April 28, 1993

successful in this attempt in the budgeting process to take care of a road in his district, then there's 117 others in this room that should be getting Amendments ready when this Bill comes back. This is blatant plus it's taking out of the pocket of the Department of Transportations' efforts in every district in here when someone comes in here and ask for a special favor. Defeat this Amendment."

- Speaker McPike: "Representative Brunsvold, for what reason do you arise?"
- Brunsvold: "Just to clarify my remarks. I don't know if anyone caught that...the suttle little remark about Mr. Ryder or not, but you should be voting 'yes' on this Amendment. We need to stop the hundreds of millions of dollars being spent in that area for very few people."
- Speaker McPike: "Representative Stephens."
- Stephens: "Well, first of all, to ask for a roll call on this secondly, Amendment; and, to...to the Amendment. Representative Edley, what you are demonstrating here is going to be a...a statement about your effectiveness as a Legislator. I think that you have taken a terrible risk on your part, because what you have done is break precedent with over dozens of years here in the House. right to be partisan, Sir, but it is...it is not all right to be irresponsible. And your actions in this Amendment, are irresponsible, and I rise in opposition and ask for a Roll Call Vote."
- Speaker McPike: "All right. The question is, 'Shall Amendment #4

 be adopted?' All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'no'.

 Have all voted? Representative Black."
- Black: "I'd just like to explain my vote, Mr. Speaker. There've been times down here when I've cooperated with Members on your side. We had a project that wasn't ready or we

51st Legislative Day

April 28, 1993

couldn't spend the money in a timely fashion, I don't mind doing that. Members on your side of the aisle have done the same for us. If we have a project ready to go, and they have a project in the planning stages that they couldn't get to, we trade back and forth all the time, but this isn't a trade. This is somebody walking in and say, 'Because I'm in the Majority Party, I'm taking something out of your district, and putting it in mine'. I don't think we want to get that started down here on either side of the aisle, no matter who's in the Chair. That's a very dangerous precedent."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Edley, to explain his vote."

Edley: "First of all, if IDOT would respond...you know, we're currently voting on a budget without IDOT detailing what they're gonna spend their money on next year, and what I'm telling you. is that this \$40 million project, Representative Brunsvold has said, doesn't have regional support. The 67 project, which this funding will go into, is supported from the Quad Cities up and down the 67 corridor all the way down to Alton. And I'm not saying that we don't build the highway; what I'm saying is, let's delay it for a while until we get some οf transportation needs taken care of in western Illinois. This is not taking money from anybody."

Speaker McPike: "Have all voted? Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Tenhouse, for what reason do you arise, Mr. Tenhouse. No reason. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record? On this Motion, there are 60 'ayes', 52 'noes'; Amendment #4 is adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk Rossi: "Floor Amendment #5, offered by Representative Woolard."

51st Legislative Day

April 28, 1993

Speaker McPike: "Mr. Woolard."

Woolard: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. What Amendment #5 does is codifies and allows for the funding for a Bill that we got substantive language passed out of a couple of weeks ago. This gives transportation...rural transportation districts funding the same as the mass transportation urban areas do now; \$400,000 for rides and southeastern Illinois, and south central Illinois mass transit system, \$250,000. I would appreciate an 'aye' vote."

Speaker McPike: "...Salvi on the Amendment."

Salvi: "Actually, I rise for a point of personal privilege."

Speaker McPike: "State your point."

Salvi: "Since we're not going to be in Session Friday, we just wanted to celebrate Tom Johnson's 48th birthday today, and all of you that would like a piece of Tom Johnson's birthday cake, you're welcome to come down here for a piece. Thank you very much."

Speaker McPike: "The question is, 'Shall Amendment #5 be adopted?' All in favor say 'aye'; opposed, 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk Rossi: "Floor Amendment #6, offered by Representative Edley."

Speaker McPike: "Mr. Edley. Gentleman withdraws Amendment #6.

Further Amendments?"

Clerk Rossi: "Floor Amendment #7, offered by Representative Edley."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Edley."

Edley: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the General Assembly. We are in the process of appropriating and reappropriating funds in anticipation of a...of a

51st Legislative Day

April 28, 1993

Clinton job creation Bill, and I...what Amendment 7 does is increase the amount of road funds going to our needy counties and state, a lot of freezing and thawing, and many of our rural highways are in bad shape. We can't expend this money in the 60-day window that is necessary to meet the federal guidelines, and I would urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker McPike: "The question is, 'Shall Amendment #7 be
 adopted?' All in favor say 'aye'; opposed, 'no'. The
 'noes' have it and the Amendment's defeated. Further
 Amendments?"

Clerk Rossi: "Floor Amendment #8, offered by Representative Hartke."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Hartke."

Hartke: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Members of Amendment #8 reappropriates about \$10 million for projects in my district. It was interesting to listen to Mr. Olson when he said that the five-year plan has been there and been approved and so forth. For eight years, I've been trying to get two overpasses in the City of Effingham, which is known as the crossroads of opportunity. Effingham intersects Interstate 57, 70, U.S. 40, 45, 32, 33 and 37, plus we have two railroads that intersect in the middle of town the Illinois Central Gulf and the Conrail. Many of the people there are just making a very bad habit of going around the gates on the railroad tracks, and one of these days, we're going to have a major disaster in that community. My request for these funds are for the city and the people of Effingles so they have an opportunity to get around for the safety and health and welfare of the entire community, and I appreciate your support."

Speaker McPike: "The question is, 'Shall Amendment #8 be adopted?' All in favor say 'aye'; opposed, 'no'. The

51st Legislative Day

- April 28, 1993
- 'noes' have it, and the Amendment's defeated. Further Amendments?"
- Clerk Rossi: "Floor Amendment #9, offered by Representative
 Novak."
- Speaker McPike: "Representative Novak. Mr. Novak."
- Novak: "Yes, with deference to the Majority Leader and the Speaker, I'll withdraw this Amendment."
- Speaker McPike: "Gentleman withdraws the Amendment. It could have been close. Representative... Further Amendments,
 Mr. Clerk?"
- Clerk Rossi: "Floor Amendment #10, offered by Representative Pankau."
- Speaker McPike: "Representative Pankau."
- I will take a stab at this, too, Pankau: "Thank you, Speaker. although I did notice the quickness with which you moved on the last one. This is a project in the Schaumburg area called the Schaumburg Triangle. Recently I was talking to a lady who told me that she goes seven miles to work and back every day within the Schaumburg area. During rush hour time, it takes her 45 minutes to go home at night, and that's mainly because of the Schaumburg Triangle, which is basically Golf Road, Higgins Road, and Roselle Road. This not only affects my district, but it affects Representative Parke's district and Representative Wojcik's district. We're not asking for any additional moneys, we're asking for moneys to be moved around. This project has been studied for over five years; and finally, the study is done and it's time to move on and get something done in that area. I ask for your favorable approval."
- Speaker McPike: "The question is, 'Shall Amendment #10 be adopted?' All in favor say 'aye'; opposed, 'no'. The 'noes' have it, and the Amendment's defeated. Further

51st Legislative Day

April 28, 1993

- Amendments?"
- Clerk Rossi: "Floor Amendment #11, offered by Representative Sheehy."
- Speaker McPike: "Has this Amendment been printed? Is it printed?

 Representative Sheehy."
- Sheehy: "Thank you, Speaker. Thank you, Speaker. Amendment #11 would provide funding for the improvement of a road within my district. The Southwest Council of Mayors and Managers called for the improvement, and we've...Orland Park itself has paid for phase one; we're asking for funding for phase two from the Road Fund to be given to IDOT, and I ask for your vote, both sides of the aisle here."
- Speaker McPike: "The question is, 'Shall Amendment #11 be adopted?' All in favor say 'aye'; opposed, 'no'. The 'noes' have it and the Amendment is defeated. Further Amendments?"
- Clerk Rossi: "No further Amendments."
- Speaker McPike: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 1247, a Bill for an Act making appropriations and reappropriations to the Department of Transportation. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker McPike: "The question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'no'.

 Representative Saltsman, for a point of clarification to explain his vote."
- Saltsman: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. We just want it understood that our intent is not to cut the five-year program that is not released yet by the Governor. We need his numbers so we can justify that we're satisfied with the five-year plan, and I'm sure we'll be able to work that out as soon as Representative Tenhouse and them can persuade the Governor to give us the figures."

51st Legislative Day

April 28, 1993

Speaker McPike: "Representative Brunsvold."

- Brunsvold: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I've just had a discussion with Senator Donahue who said she's gonna send me an order of duck's feet, uncleaned and uncooked."
- Speaker McPike: "Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this Motion, there are 105 'ayes', 3 'noes'. House Bill 1247, having received the Constitutional Majority... Representative Saltsman votes 'aye'. Representative Zickus."
- Zickus: "Yes. I'd like to be recorded as 'yes', please."
- Speaker McPike: "Zickus, 'aye'. Dart, 'aye'. Any further? On this Motion, there is 108 'ayes', 3 'noes'. House Bill 1247, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1326. It's been read a second time. Mr. Clerk, any Amendments?"

Clerk Rossi: "No Floor Amendments."

- Speaker McPike: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 1326, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for ordinary and contingent expenses of the Office of the State Treasurer. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker McPike: "Representative Hanniq."
- Hannig: "Yes. Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House.

 This appropriates \$12,512,000 from GRF for the ordinary and contingent expense of the Treasurer. It's a reduction of \$2,136,000, or 14.6% from last year, and I move for its passage."
- Speaker McPike: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 1326 pass?'
 All those in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'no'. Have all
 voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the
 record. On this Motion, there is 112 'ayes' and 0 'nays'.
 House Bill 1326, having received the Constitutional
 Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1525 has

51st Legislative Day

April 28, 1993

been read a second time. Mr. Clerk, any...any Amendments?"

Clerk Rossi: "Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Hanniq."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Hannig."

Hannig: "Yes. Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House.

This is an Amendment that came to us because our staff found a duplication in the Secretary of State's budget, and we've discussed it with the Secretary, with the other side of the aisle. It is not a hostile Amendment, it is an agreed Amendment. I move for its adoption."

Speaker McPike: "The question is, 'Shall Amendment #1 be adopted?' All in favor say 'aye'; opposed, 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, and the Amendment's adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk Rossi: "No further Amendments."

Speaker McPike: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 1525, a Bill for an Act providing for the ordinary and contingent and distributive expenses of the Office of the Secretary of State. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Olson."

8

Olson: "I simply ask that the Body support the passage of this Bill."

Speaker McPike: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 1525 pass?'
All those in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'no'. Have all
voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the
record. On this Motion, there are 112 'ayes' and 0 'nays'.
House Bill 1525, having received the Constitutional
Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1551, on
Second Reading. Mr. Clerk, any Amendments?"

Clerk Rossi: "No Floor Amendments."

Speaker McPike: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

51st Legislative Day

April 28, 1993

Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 1551, a Bill for an Act to provide for the ordinary, contingent and distributive expenses of the State Comptroller. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Hannig."

Hannig: "Yes. Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House.

This appropriates \$45,237,000 or \$4,268,000 increase for the Office of the Comptroller, and I'd move for its passage."

Speaker McPike: "And, on that Motion, Representative Ryder."

Ryder: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Just to bring to the attention of the group that the amount requested by the Comptroller and the Bill, as unamended, does exceed the level that the Governor requested in the Governor's budget. So, this is going over the budget, for those who might be interested in that aspect. Thank you."

Speaker McPike: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 1551 pass?'
All those in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'no'. Have all
voted? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish?
The Clerk will take the record. On this Motion, there are
88 'ayes' and 19 'noes'. House Bill 1551, having received
the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed.
House Bill 1721 is on Second Reading. Mr. Clerk, any
Amendments?"

Speaker McPike: "Representative Saltsman."

Saltsman: "Yes. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is also a reduction..."

Speaker McPike: "Are you going to withdraw this Amendment?"

Saltsman: "Withdraw Amendment #1."

Speaker McPike: "Any further Amendments?"

Clerk Rossi: "Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative

51st Legislative Day

April 28, 1993

Saltsman."

- Speaker McPike: "Representative Saltsman."
- Saltsman: "Yes. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This line item of cuts...will reduce all the operation lines in the '93 estimated expenditures and eliminate new program expansions and...for a total of \$432,000. Ask for its passage."
- Speaker McPike: "The question is, 'Shall Amendment #2 be adopted?' All in favor say 'aye'; opposed, 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, and the Amendment's adopted. Further Amendments?"
- Clerk Rossi: "No further Amendments."
- Speaker McPike: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 1721, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the Office of the States Attorney's Appellate Prosecutor. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker McPike: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 1721 pass?'

 All those in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this Motion, there is lll 'ayes' and 0 'nays'. House Bill 1721, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1885 is on Second Reading. Mr. Clerk, any Amendments?"
- Clerk Rossi: "Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Saltsman."
- Speaker McPike: "Representative Saltsman."
- Saltsman: "Yes. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is the Office of Public Defender and negate our budget cuts for a total of \$1,880,900. Eliminates many new positions and it reduces operating lines above and beyond the '93...1993 expenditures, and some contractual services. I ask for its passage."

51st Legislative Day April 28, 1993

Speaker McPike: "And on that Motion, Representative Homer."

Homer: "Question for the Sponsor?"

Speaker McPike: "Yes."

Homer: "What's the dollar amount of the cut?"

Saltsman: "\$One million eight-hundred, eighty-eight thousand dollars."

Homer: "On a budget of \$7,331,000?"

Saltsman: "Correct."

Homer: "All right. That's... Well, Mr. Speaker, to the Bill. I...to the Amendment. I don't have any...I don't harbor any illusions about being able to defeat this Amendment. I understand this Amendment's going to pass. I would just like to state for the record that a 20% to 25% cut in the Office of the State Appellate Defender would literally bring the criminal justice system to a screeching halt which would be bad for victims of crime, which would be bad for the people of the State of Illinois. There's no way that this agency could operate with this kind of a cut which amounts to almost 25% of their budget, and so while I recognize that this Amendment may go on today, I'm going to 'no', and I hope that when this Bill comes back in a conference report, that we will...that we will be realistic and not try to...to cut this important agency by amount."

Speaker McPike: "The question is, 'Shall Amendment #1 be adopted?' All in favor say 'aye'; opposed, 'no'. The 'ayes' have it and the Amendment's adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk Rossi: "No further Amendments."

Speaker McPike: "Third Reading, Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 1885, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for the Office of the State Appellate

0 350

51st Legislative Day

April 28, 1993

Defender. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker McPike: "The question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this Motion, there is 110 'ayes' and 2 'noes'. House Bill 1885, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2203 is on Second Reading. Mr. Clerk, are there any Amendments?"

Clerk Rossi: "No Floor Amendments."

Speaker McPike: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 2203, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to certain state agencies. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Hannig."

Hannig: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. This appropriates \$27,867,000 to the Attorney General. That's an increase of \$54,000 or two-tenths of 1%, and I'd move for the passage of this Bill."

Speaker McPike: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 2203 pass?'

All those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this Motion, there is 110 'ayes' and 1 'no'. House Bill 2203, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 805. Mr. Clerk, are there any Amendments? It's on Second Reading."

Clerk Rossi: "No Floor Amendments."

Speaker McPike: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill." --

Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 805, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the Metropolitan Pier and Exposition Authority. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Capparelli."

51st Legislative Day

April 28, 1993

Capparelli: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 805 appropriates \$31,368,000 for the Metropolitan Pier and Exposition Authority. It's an annual appropriation. I ask for a favorable roll call."

Speaker McPike: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 805 pass?'

All those in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this Motion, there is lll 'ayes' and 0 'nays'.

House Bill 805, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1693 is on Second Reading. Mr. Clerk, any Amendments?"

Clerk Rossi: "No Floor Amendments."

Speaker McPike: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 1693, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for downstate health care. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker McPike: "All right. Representative Phelps."

Phelps: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the General Assembly. This is a package to compromise downsizing of downscale of the \$22 million package that was signed into law as far as the substantive language. One of the Bills that Governor Thompson signed, and we have gone three years without any funding. It called for \$22 million, but we've offered \$6,750,000 which is not for a particular part of the state; it's a statewide initiative. It's just first phase to say we've put some preventative money in and see if we can't save a lot more taxpayers dollars. what it does is actually appropriates \$1 million to provide matching grants for community-based organization comprehensive primary care; \$1 million to migrant health centers to expand service; develop and operate regional AMNET systems, \$750,000; \$1 million for grants to hospitals

51st Legislative Day

April 28, 1993

to diversify services and convert to facilities that are less dependent on acute care bed capacity; and \$250,000 to establish a program to provide scholarships to allied health professionals; \$1,700,000 will go to develop a primary care clinics and establish the first obstetrical care center; \$50,000 for the monitoring and review progress of rural downstate health goals to see if they're being met; and \$900,000 appropriated to the rural...to establish a rural medical education program within the University of Illinois. SIU school of medicine has also incorporated into this. It's a cheap package considered what was initially asked, and we ask your support. It goes a long way to help a lot of people."

Speaker McPike: "And on that Motion, Representative Weller."
Weller: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker McPike: "Yes."

Weller: "Representative, it's my understanding from your remarks and the history of this program, the program's three years old; has the program ever been funded?"

Phelps: "This has never been funded, Representative."

Weller: "So, this would be the first time this program has ever been funded?"

Phelps: "Right, and this falls on the heels...this was what the Lieutenant Governor then, was George Ryan who offered the rural health initiative program and had hearings throughout the state, and recommended that the total appropriation be \$2 million. We know we can't do that, but we have ways to...that I can offer in closing, how to pay for this. Let me give you an example why I think it's a good... What may be coming out real soon that many us do not know in this Body what I think is outrageous that we don't have this info, and I had to dig pretty deep for it, but I hold in my

51st Legislative Day

April 28, 1993

hand a list of funds that are retained as investment income into designated areas. Various lists of, for example, Build Illinois, Bond Retirement and Interest Fund, has \$25,942 in interest that goes back, not in the GRF, but comes back into that fund; we have \$1,183,000, Common School Fund interest, goes back into that fund, we can go on and on; it totals \$61 million in the last year or so...that has interest accumulated going back in the fund, not in the GRF. So, that's one way to pay for it."

Weller: "One last...one last question there, Representative.

The...have you identified a funding source for this
\$6,650,000? I know in the past you've..."

Speaker McPike: "Mr. Phelps."

Phelps: "That's exactly what I totalled. What I'm looking for."

Weller: "Have you..."

Speaker McPike: "He just answered that question, Mr. Weller. Mr. Weller."

Weller: "I was just trying to ask if he had a specific funding source or..."

Speaker McPike: "He just answered that question."

Phelps: "Yes."

Speaker McPike: "Do you have any other questions?"

Weller: "That investment income and also the inheritance tax is up \$30 million. I think that we could look at that. \$6 million measly."

Phelps: "This is a Bill of great interest to downstaters in particular. It's a good Bill."

Weller: "I appreciate..."

Speaker McPike: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 1693 pass?'

All those in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish?

The Clerk will take the record. On this Motion, there are

51st Legislative Day

April 28, 1993

84 'ayes' and 26 'noes'. House Bill 1693, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2318 is on Second Reading. Mr. Clerk, any Amendments?"

Clerk Rossi: "No Floor Amendments."

Speaker McPike: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 2318, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Lou Jones. Lou Jones. Is the Lady here? Take this Bill out of the record. House Bill 28. Mr. Clerk, the Bill is on Third Reading. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk. My error. The Bill's on Second Reading, Mr. Clerk. Are there any Amendments?"

Clerk Rossi: "No Floor Amendments."

Speaker McPike: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 28, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the State Fire Marshal. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker McPike: "All right. Mr. Johnson, on the Bill."

Johnson, Tim: "The Bill, Mr. Speaker, incorporates part of the money that we had sought to appropriate in House Bill 583...actually adds a 300% reduction to \$1 million for a project called 'Hope for the Children' which is a partial reuse of Chanute Air Force Base. Testimony in committee, which I think was extraordinarily well received, was made by a...Brenda Ehart from Champaign and from others. The supporters of this project include Senator Simon, Brenda Edgar, the Village of Rantoul; and otherwise say some start-up money for the use of facilities at Chanute Air Force Base for alternatives to foster care, in effect. The project over the long haul, I believe, DCFS believes would be cost savings, and it's a modest investment in a

51st Legislative Day

April 28, 1993

extraordinarily important project, not only for the area, but more importantly for the state."

Speaker McPike: "All right. Representative Hannig."

Hannig: "Yes. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker McPike: "Yes."

Johnson. Tim: "That's correct."

Hannig: "And now, is this appropriation not in their budget as it
 came over from the Senate?"

Johnson, Tim: "Correct. I don't know about it when it came over from the Senate."

Johnson, Tim: "Well, I think they're still in the process of weighing this. I know I've had several meetings myself. I believe Brenda Ehart, John Hirschfeldt and others with the department, and I believe that they're still in the process of considering whether to incorporate this or not. I know it's a project that's gotten a friendly ear from not...from both sides of the aisle, and in particular from DCFS. I can't speak for the Senate or their proposition the Senate."

Hannig: "Well, to the Bill, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House.

Very briefly, we work very hard now not to have a lot of pork put on to this budget. We worked very hard to defeat Amendments that the various Members have offered that probably are important to their district in some way or another. But, here's a project where Members come forward and he said that this is..this is something that he would like to see in his district. What I would suggest, as was

51st Legislative Day

April 28, 1993

stated from the other side of the aisle, some of the other Amendments earlier, that he should talk with the director, that he should try to work with the budget people from DCFS, that he should simply try to get this into his budget. We worked hard not to have these special projects and to get a budget that's balanced, and I would suggest that this \$1 million is just an add-on, that it's just pork, and that we should defeat it, and I ask a 'no' vote."

Speaker McPike: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 28 pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'no'. Representative Johnson, to explain his vote."

Johnson, Tim: "This is anything but pork. This is only relatively minor significance in terms of its location at Chanute Air Force Base. The project concentrates placing young people at risk due to parental drug and dependency. groups of young siblings and family care homes. It's a model project that's received the of individuals in social service throughout the support country, and here in this area. It's simply going to be located if it is at Chanute, because that's the most cost effective place to locate it. This project is anything...the very contrary of any kind of a pork project, and I understand what Representative Hanniq is saying, and I agree with what he's saying. If you could have heard the testimony and see the mounds of material in support of this legislation and what it would do in terms of providing benefits and opportunities and hope for young children, you vould clearly see that it's anything but a pork project."

Speaker McPike: "All right. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this Motion, there are 48 'ayes' and

51st Legislative Day

April 28, 1993

- 52 'noes'. House Bill 28, having failed to receive the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared lost. House Bill 56 is on Second Reading. Mr. Clerk, any Amendments?"
- Clerk Rossi: "Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Younge."
- Speaker McPike: "Representative Younge, on Amendment #1."
- Younge: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Could we withdraw Amendment #1?"
- Speaker McPike: "Yes. Amendment #1 is withdrawn. Further
 Amendments?"
- Clerk Rossi: "Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Younge."
- Speaker McPike: "Representative Younge."
- Younge: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Amendment #2 would appropriate \$1 million to the East St. Louis school district for the repair of the districts school buildings. I have an emergency situation in which the roof of the senior high school is leaking so badly as to destroy the whole property. The property is worth some \$24 million and there is such a leaky condition in the roof, that the whole building is being destroyed and it would end up with the floor and the floor is damaged, and it is an example of the savage inequities that exist. The school district has no money to repair this building, and Representative Frederick has agreed to the Amendment."
- Speaker McPike: "All right, and on the Amendment, Representative Ryder."
- Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I admire the sincerity and tenacity of the Sponsor, but unfortunately, it's very difficult for me or anyone here to be able to support the Lady's request for an additional \$1 million for her school when all of our schools would like to have additional

51st Legislative Day

April 28, 1993

money, too; especilly those schools in the suburban area that don't receive very much, if anything, under the school aid formula, and to give \$1 million at this situation to this individual is just not appropriate at this time, however worthy this cause may be. And I reluctantly rise and ask for a roll call."

Speaker McPike: "The question is, 'Shall Amendment #2 be adopted?' All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'no'.

Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this Motion, there are 40 'ayes' and 62 'noes'. Amendment #2 is defeated. Further Amendments?"

Clerk Rossi: "No further Amendments."

Speaker McPike: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 56, a Bill for an Act in relation to funding of education. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Andrea Moore, for what reason do you arise?"

Moore, A: "I'd like to speak to the Bill, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker McPike: "All right. It's Representative Frederick's

Bill. Do you wish to present it, or does she?"

Moore, A: "No, she is. She's standing in line."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Frederick."

Frederick: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 56 appropriates \$1 million to the State Board of Education for a grant to the North Chicago school system, Unit District 187, for emergency assistance and to prevent dissolution of the school district. Why did North Chicago arrive at point of dissolution? One of the reasons is that half of the property within the City of North Chicago is tax exempt, and that is because of the location of the veteran's hospital and a military base

51st Legislative Day

April 28, 1993

there. As a result, North Chicago has the lowest assessed valuation in Lake County, and at the same time, the highest tax rate in Lake County. North Chicago draws one half of its students from the military base, but the federal government only pays one-third the cost of educating those students in impact aid; and finally, the State of Illinois has delayed paying the final incentive money for the recent consolidation of the District 187 into a unit district. North Chicago District 187 is truly unique in this state. It has factors that affect its funding expectations that no other school district has. So, I ask you for your 'aye' vote."

Speaker McPike: "And on that Motion, Representative Hannig."

Hannig: "Yes. Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I understand that the Lady's trying to address a problem in her district...but I have to say quite frankly that in this school issue, we're all in this thing together. You know, the City of Chicago public schools are having problems. three school districts consolidated I've had legislative district just last year, and it seems to me that if we're going to solve the problem of education, let's solve it for everybody. Let's try to find more money for elementary and secondary education. Let's try to address the problem of the state aid formula, but coming in and doing this thing on a piecemeal basis, and asking for special consideration for one school district is the way to do it. I think we have to all live together in the State of Illinois. We're all in it together, and I'd ask that you vote 'no' on this piece of legislation for just one school district."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Andrea Moore."

Moore, A: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. I would agree

51st Legislative Day

April 28, 1993

Representative Hannig, but with this is not special legislation for one special school district alone. important to know that over half of those students are from the Great Lakes Naval Base, and the economic impact of losing that base to the State of Illinois estimated loss \$450 million just to the local communities; tax revenues lost, \$23,000,399 in 1993. North Chicago is the poorest community in Lake County and few communities rank lower in all of Illinois. The economic impact on North Chicago with its high minority population and low per capita income of the closing of Great Lakes would be staggering. Diego, as in the last few days, there are testimony being delivered about the school system in North Chicago and how it will not serve our government well to keep that The Legislature in California has given special appropriations for the base in San Diego, and I think appropriate that we do the same. This is a school district that desperately needs this money, and the State of Illinois desperately needs to show its commitment to the Great Lakes Naval area so that this base will stay open, and I respectfully request an 'aye' vote."

Speaker McPike: "Representative von Bergen-Wessels."

won Bergen-Wessels: "Thank you, Speaker. I rise against House Bill 56. I too have a unique situation in my district. I have Mount Morris. They're \$1.2 million in debt. Just two weeks ago, the state Board of Education refused to approve their financial package. They are more than likely going to be forced to stay open for an additional year, with \$1.2 million in debt and not a clue as to where the money will come from to keep that store...that school operating while they go through the litigation process. I understand the Sponsor's need to help her district. I

51st Legislative Day

- April 28, 1993
- admire that. I respect the Lady, but I cannot vote for this Bill when I have every bit as dire situation in my district. Thank you."
- Speaker McPike: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 56 pass?'

 All those in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'no'.

 Representative Davis, to explain her vote."
- Davis: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen. I certainly recognize the terrible conditions that this district might find itself; however, I, too, come from a district where the schools are in dire need of dollars, and I don't know who we help when we do it district by district and not for all the children in the state."
- Speaker McPike: "Representative Saltsman, to explain his vote.

 All right. Representative Olson to explain his vote."
- Olson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Representative Frederick is one of my dearest friends in this General Assembly and I would love to support her on this issue, but just Monday I had a school down here that is being closed in my district, and I understand her problems. Virginia, I couldn't go back to my district if I vote for you on this issue, because when I come back next week, I would be tarred and feathered. Thank you very much for letting me address this."
- Speaker McPike: "Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The

 Clerk will take the record. On this Motion, there are 36

 'ayes' and 75 'noes'. House Bill 56, having failed to
 receive the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared
 lost. And that is the end of all the approp Bills.

 Representative Steczo, in the Chair."
- Speaker Steczo: "The Chair will move to the Order of House Bills,

 Third Reading. House Bill 1730... For what purpose does
 the Gentleman from Rock Island, Representative Brunsvold,
 seek recognition?"

51st Legislative Day

April 28, 1993

- Brunsvold: "Speaker, I'd like to make a Motion. I would move to suspend the..."
- Speaker Steczo: "What's the Motion, Mr. Brunsvold?"
- Brunsvold: "I would move to suspend the deadline on House Bill 1550 until January 14, 1994."
- Speaker Steczo: "Brunsvold, that Motion is not appropriate at this time. House Bill 1736, Representative Hicks. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 1736, a Bill for an Act amending the Revenue Act of 1939. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Steczo: "The Gentleman from Jefferson, Representative Hicks."
- Hicks: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 1736, as amended, becomes the Bill that you listened to yesterday with the Amendments that were placed on it dealing with the abatement of taxes whereby businesses would come into a community and ask certain property taxes be abated. If that company chose to leave that area without spending appropriate time...and if that company had accepted an incentive package to locate there and then took the business and went elsewhere, there would be repayment involved in taking that abatement. So I'd be happy to answer any questions anyone may have."
- Speaker Steczo: "The Gentleman has moved for the passage of House Bill 736. (House Bill) 1736. On that question, is there any discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All those in favor will signify by voting 'aye'; those opposed by voting 'no'. The voting 'aye'copen. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 113 voting 'aye', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'; and House Bill 1736, having received the

51st Legislative Day

April 28, 1993

required Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 324, Representative Dunn. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 324. The Bill has been read a third time previously and is on Consideration Postponed."

Speaker Steczo: "The Gentleman from Macon, Representative Dunn."

Dunn: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This is a Bill which has passed this House by a practically unanimous Roll Call Vote in the past. It is a Bill which would create the Respiratory Care Practice Act to license respiratory therapists. I'd be happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Steczo: "The Gentleman has moved for the passage of House
Bill 324. On that question, is there any discussion? The
Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Will, Representative
Wennlund."

Wennlund: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Steczo: "He indicates that he will."

Wennlund: "Is this the Bill that provides for licensing of respiratory therapists?"

Dunn: "Yes."

Wennlund: "And this Bill failed on Third Reading the first time?" Dunn: "Yes. This is a Bob LeFlore Bill, and as you know, he is

Wennlund: "A what? I'm sorry."

not..."

Dunn: "This is Bob LeFlore's...it's a LeFlore Dunn Bill, and Bob LeFlore's Bill, and he's, as you know, not well and the Bill was called one day last week when I was off the floor and I told him I would handle it for him. So, I hope everybody can vote for this Bill."

Wennlund: "And is there a hold harmless for the department to not

51st Legislative Day

April 28, 1993

- begin to implement the Bill until there's sufficient funds appropriated to the department?"
- Dunn: "You may know better about that than I do. There is a start-up provision for the Bill, and I can't tell you right now whether there's a hold harmless or not."

Wennlund: "I'm sorry, Representative Dunn."

- Dunn: "I don't want to mislead you. I'm not sure it's in there."
- Wennlund: "It... Can you tell us what the start-up costs are?"
- Dunn: "Well, to answer your question, this is a Bill that will pay for itself through the profession, that is for sure. So, the...the respiratory therapists will pay the costs of this Bill."
- Wennlund: "Is there a mandate in this Bill that would require nursing homes and hospitals to have a respiratory therapist on staff at all times?"
- Dunn: "I don't see that in the Bill. Do you? This...the issues that have come up with this legislation, Mr. Wennlund, are the issues of cross-licensing and that really is not a threat or concern here, and...and the generic concerns about licensing Bills. Those are the only two criticisms that have come up."
- Wennlund: "And it's still opposed by the Illinois Hospital

 Association and the Department of Professional Regulation."
- Dunn: "They may officially have a position about this, but not all hospitals are opposed to this and a prominent hospital, the, Loyola University Medical Center in Chicago, is on record in favor of this legislation."
- Wennlund: "Thank you. Thank you, Representative Dunn. To the Bill. The Illinois Hospital Association does oppose this Bill because it would add respiratory therapy to the list of regulated health care occupations in Illinois. It would put dollars into the pockets of respiratory therapists, but

51st Legislative Day

April 28, 1993

it would also increase the cost of health care and reduce access to care, and that's the reason the Illinois Hospital Association is opposed to it. because, ultimately it's...you know, this is like every licensing we've ever considered. It's the close the group...to close the group down and then they could increase fees because you wouldn't be allowed to exercise the opportunity to be a therapist unless, in fact, you were licensed under the terms of this Bill, and that's the way they all work. We worry about the high cost of health care in Illinois and what causes it. This is exactly what causes it. Continuing expansion of licensing to every single factor and facet of the medical profession. That's why this Bill lost the first time was called for a vote. That's why it only got 53 votes, and that's why you should vote against it this time."

Speaker Steczo: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from McHenry, Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "Mr. Speaker, probably nobody in this room has ever seen a licensing Bill come to the General Assembly with consumers saying, 'Please regulate this profession'. Certainly you have received no letters from any consumer saying, 'Please regulate respiratory therapists; they're doing a rotten job'. What Representative Wennlund said is absolutely correct. This is more than a generic attack on licensing more people in the State of Illinois. It is a question of whether you want health care costs to go up. If you want health care costs to go up, vote 'yes'. I can't say if you vote 'no' : hav'll go down, but I guarantee you, they'll go up if you vote 'yes'."

Speaker Steczo: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Grundy,

Representative Weller."

Weller: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the

51st Legislative Day

April 28, 1993

This is one of those Bills you've been hearin' about from your local hospitals urgin' you to vote 'no'. You know. frankly, some would call this Bill health care reform. That's not what it is. This year, we're reform our health care system to make it more flexible and responsive to the needs of patients to unnecessary costs and expand access to care for all our citizens. This Bill takes us in the opposite direction. Far from encouraging flexibility, this Bill would force a perfectly qualified nurse to stand aside and wait when an oxygen mask needs to be replaced or a shot administered or a button on a machine pushed. The patient would have to wait until someone locates a licensed respiratory therapist to take an action for which others have been trained and have proven their competence to take, and while the patient is waiting there for care, the meter's running and ticking, and his or her Bill for health care is climbing. Who knows how much that shot will cost by the time he gets it? Μv friends, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this Bill doesn't go the right way. Let's not go this way. We to be looking at ways to deregulate and reduce costs. need to look at our health care system and try and find ways to make health care more accessible and reduce costs. The best vote's a 'no' vote if you care about health care costs. I ask you to vote 'no'."

Speaker Steczo: "The Chair recognizes the Lady from Cook, Representative Parcells."

Parcells: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I, too, rise in opposition to this Bill. A point that hasn't been brought out is that right now there are presently about 2,000 respiratory therapists out there. If this Bill goes through, 600 of those people would be

51st Legislative Day

April 28, 1993

unemployed. They haven't had the training and necessary credentials, so that they would be working. Ιn these times of very tough health care decisions to be made, this would be a very detrimental Bill to pass. would...there'd be very costly in start-up costs. Yes, eventually they'd be paying fees in, but the Department has no money for this now, and there's a lot of start-up costs; hundreds of thousands of dollars worth of start-up costs. In the ten years that this has...this Bill has come before us because respiratory therapists want that designation for themselves, in all that time, not once has there been any evidence that it's been produced of any adverse effects which regulation of respiratory therapists would save The nurses that are doing it now are very well from. qualified. There is no reason that these people have to be licensed. It would be costly and in this year when we're trying to bring down health care costs, it would be the worst possible year to pass it. I ask that you vote against this Bill for the second time in this Session."

Speaker Steczo: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from DuPage,
Representative Roskam."

Roskam: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This is one of those classic examples where we are able to demonstrate that we have restraint. We can restrain ourselves from exacerbating a tremendous problem in Illinois, and that is fueling the fire of rising health care costs. We are bleeding to death in this state from little the shaving cuts, and this is just another example of us sitting here in our wisdom and passing legislation that is going to boost costs, hurt consumers, and have a dilatory effect on this whole process, and I would ask you to vote 'no'."

51st Legislative Day

April 28, 1993

Speaker Steczo: "The Gentleman from Macon, Representative Dunn,
to close."

Dunn: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the You've heard a lot of negative comments and let me just indicate that if this proposal is so bad, I would doubt if any other states would enact it; however, each of the states, not just one or two, but each of the states which adjoins the State of Illinois already has this type of legislation on its books. Thirty states in the United States of America have enacted this type of legislation. This legislation provides for professional status for those who provide respiratory care to those who have breathing problems. If any of you have ever been in a situation where you have seen or had to use that equipment, you know, for example, that there are disposable pieces which are used to enable you to be tested or to be...to receive rehabilitation breathing from those machines; however, even though the disposable pieces are removed, the machine is The next person that has to use that machine, do you not. want someone who isn't trained, who isn't qualified to be cleaning out the machine for the next patient who might be you, or do you want someone who is professionally licensed, someone who has met criteria, someone who is responsible on There are objections about cross-training. That's not a problem. That has been worked out. have been comments that the Hospital Association's against it. Yes, but there are a lot of hospitals that wish they had this including the preeminent Loyola School of Medicine in Chicago. This is good legislation. Let's pass this for Bob LeFlore. Put green votes up there on the board. Thank you."

Speaker Steczo: "The Gentleman has moved for the passage of House

51st Legislative Day

April 28, 1993

- Bill 324. The question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All those in favor will signify by voting 'aye'; those opposed by voting 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 46 voting 'yes', 60 voting 'no', 9 voting 'present'; and House Bill 324, having failed to receive the required Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared lost. House Bill 704, Representative Curran. Is Mr. Curran in the chamber? Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk McLennand: "House Bill 704, a Bill for an Act amending the Elections Code. Senate Bill's been read a second time previously. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. No Motions filed. Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Biggins. Biggins."
- Speaker Steczo: "The Chair recognizes Representative Curran.

 Representative Curran?"
- Curran: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, for sake of moving along the House in its business today, I would like to, by voice vote...by voice vote, accept Amendments 2 through 12."
- Speaker Steczo: "The Gentleman has asked for the adoption of Amendments 2 through Amendment #12 on House Bill 704. He'd ask leave to accept...to hear all those on the same roll call. Is there objection? There being no objection, leave is granted. The Gentleman has moved for the adoption of Amendments #2 through 12. All those in favor will signify by saying 'aye'; those opposed by saying 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Amendments are adopted. Any further Amendments, Mr. Clerk?"
- Clerk McLennand: "Floor Amendment #13, offered by Representative Curran."

51st Legislative Day

April 28, 1993

- Speaker Steczo: "The Gentleman from Sangamon, Representative Curran."
- Curran: "Amendment #13 becomes the Bill. All it does is take this Bill that Representative Moore, who's a Minority Spokesperson of the Election and State's Government Committee and myself, makes us Sponsors of this shell Bill. We're still trying to work out some agreement. It's difficult on this issue, but we're still striving for some agreement. So, this is an agreed process at this point, and we're...yeah, and it will be a shell Bill moving it over to the Senate."
- Speaker Steczo: "The Gentleman has moved for the adoption of Amendment #13 to House Bill 704. On that, the Gentleman from Lake, Representative Churchill."
- Churchill: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise to concur with Representative Curran.

 Our side agrees that we should have this one election code shell Bill in the Senate, and so I would ask Members to support this move."
- Speaker Steczo: "All those in favor of the adoption of the Amendment will signify by saying 'aye'; those opposed 'no'.

 The 'ayes' have it. The Amendment's adopted. Any further Amendments, Mr. Clerk?"
- Clerk McLennand: "No further Amendments."
- Speaker Steczo: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk McLennand: "House Bill 704, a Bill for an Act to amend the Election Code. Third Reading of this Bill."
- Speaker Steczo: "Representative Curran."
- Curran: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The original Bill was the concept of the open primary. I want to thank Speaker Madigan for allowing that Bill to get as far as it did,

51st Legislative Day

April 28, 1993

having the process as open as it has been. I'm still striving to pass an open primary in this House, but at this point, the best we can do is to pass this shell Bill over to the Senate and keep working for an agreement. I ask for adoption of this Bill."

- Speaker Steczo: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 704 pass?'

 All those in favor will signify by voting 'aye'; those opposed by voting 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Gentleman from Perry, Representative Hawkins, to explain his vote, one minute."
- Hawkins: "I don't think that I've had any piece of legislation where I've had more favorable comments than this piece of legislation. The people of the State of Illinois, particularly in my district, want an open primary. The politicians don't want it, but the people do. Let's vote for the people."
- Speaker Steczo: "Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 97 voting 'yes', 8 voting 'no', 8 voting 'present'; and House Bill 704, having received the required Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2269, Representative Hawkins. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk McLennand: "House Bill 2269, a Bill for an Act in relation to job creation. The Bill has been read a second time previously."
- Speaker Steczo: "Any Amendments, Mr. Clerk?"
- Clerk McLennand: "No Amendments."
- Speaker Steczo: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk McLennand: "House Bill 2269, a Bill for an Act in relation to job creation. Third Reading of this Bill."

51st Legislative Day

April 28, 1993

- Speaker Steczo: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Perry,

 Representative Hawkins."
- Hawkins: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House.

 This is a shell Bill that will allow continued negotiations with the Department of Corrections, Department of Transportation, and legislative leaders concerning a resort project in my district that will create several hundred jobs. I have agreed, if this Bill comes back to the House, that I will not call the Bill unless Representative Wennlund agrees to it."
- Speaker Steczo: "Gentleman has moved for the passage of House Bill 2269; and, on that question, the Gentleman from Will, Representative Wennlund."
- Wennlund: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A question of the Sponsor.

 Just so everybody knows, there's a lot of study and a lot of research and a lot of negotiations yet to go on before this Bill can become reality, and I've agreed with Representative Hawkins that we should keep the Bill alive, let it go over to the Senate, and he has agreed with me that unless I am agreeable to have it called back over here in some other forum, and we agree with that and this Bill ought to be passed. I would ask for your support."
- Speaker Steczo: "Is there any further discussion? There being none, the question is...oh. Mr. Clerk, any further Amendments? We have read the Bill on Third, correct? Mr. Clerk, have we read the Bill?"
- Clerk McLennand: "The Bill's been read a third time."
- Speaker Steczo: "The question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All those in favor will signify by voting 'aye'; those opposed by voting 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Please record Representative Turner as 'aye'. Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On

51st Legislative Day

April 28, 1993

this question, there are 107 voting 'yes', 1 voting 'no', 4 voting 'present'; and House Bill 2269, having received the required Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 737, Representative Balanoff. Mr. Balanoff. Mr. Balanoff. Take the Bill out of the record. House Bill 1280, Representative Santiago. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

- Clerk McLennand: "House Bill 1280 The Bill is on Consideration Postponed. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Steczo: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Santiago."
- Santiago: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I yield to Representative Leitch who's going to present the Bill."
- Speaker Steczo: "The Gentleman from Peoria, Representative Leitch."
- Leitch: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, and thank you, Representative Santiago for your help with this Bill. This Bill is the one which will help about 1,000 small townships in Illinois, those who have budgets \$200,000 or less meet the mandate that we impose for every four years to have a CPA audit. This for many of the smaller townships is a very tough thing to fund, and what this Bill would provide is the ability for them to and next year raise up to \$6,000 to fund the required audit, and in subsequent years, raise up to 1,500 hours a year for the audit so that they can save some money and comply with the mandate, and I think a reasonable mandate, that we impose and There was a lot of question about this Bill yesterday, I think a lot of those answers have been a resolved, and I would certainly ask today that you help me get this very good Bill over to the Senate."

51st Legislative Day

April 28, 1993

- Speaker Steczo: "The Gentleman has moved for the passage of House
 Bill 1280. On that, is there any discussion? The
 Gentleman from Effingham, Representative Hartke."
- Hartke: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I think this...this Bill brings small townships just right up now to what cities and villages have, and I would ask for your support for House Bill 1280."
- Speaker Steczo: "The Gentleman from Peoria, Representative Saltsman."

Saltsman: "Yes. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Steczo: "He indicates that he will."

- Saltsman: "Yes. Representative Leitch, if the audit doesn't cost \$6,000, say it would only be a \$4,000 cost, would that all...is that all that they'd be able to appropriate then out of this funding?"
- Leitch: "Yes. Thank you. That's a very, very good question.

 The maximum is \$6,000, most of 'em go \$4,000, \$3,500 to \$4,000, \$4,500, but that's a very good point that you make, and I appreciate you asking that question."
- Saltsman: "Yes. Also, this money is mandated to go for that use only."

Leitch: "Absolutely."

Saltsman: "Yes. Mr. Speaker, to this Bill. We had 63 votes up there and my people got off it yesterday. I don't know, but I got 70 small townships in my district, also. This is really a good piece of legislation, and some of the people who voted 'no' for it still don't know why. They say it's a tax without a referendum, but what kind of a cax? It's earmarked, it's lettin' people help the...help them get out of the problem that we put 'em in. It's helpin' them get out of the problem that the state mandated to 'em. It's a couple pennies. Don't mess with this and vote 'yes'.

51st Legislative Day

April 28, 1993

- Let's go."
- Speaker Steczo: "Is there any further discussion? There being none... Representative Leitch, to close."
- Leitch: "I would simply ask that you help these folks out and ask for your 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Steczo: "The question is, shall House Bill 1280 pass?'

 All those in favor will signify by voting 'aye'; those opposed by voting 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Lady from Cook. Representative Zickus."
- Speaker Steczo: "Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 69 voting 'yes', 36 voting 'no', 7 voting 'present'; and House Bill 1280, having received the required Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1747, Representative Blagojevich. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk McLennand: "House Bill 1747, a Bill for an Act in relation to worker retraining. Third Reading of this Bill."
- Speaker Steczo: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Blagojevich."
- Blagojevich: "Thank you, Mr. Chairman and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 1747 is entitled the Worker...would create the Worker Retraining Act, and what that would do is, it would create under the Act the Worker Retraining Advisory Council which would review applications for loans to fund projects related to worker retraining. It would allow the Illinois Finance Authority to guarantee those loans. It is, in my view, a Bill for the '90's, and it's a Bill that I think would appeal to those of us who believe

51st Legislative Day

April 28, 1993

that government has an affirmative responsibility to work alongside with the private sector and recognize the need for markets and recognize the need that we live in an everchanging economy where skilled workers are essential to our competitiveness in a global economy. So, I would urge a 'yes' vote on this Bill, and be happy to entertain questions."

- Speaker Steczo: "The Gentleman has moved for the passage of House Bill 1747. On that question, is there any discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All those in favor will signify by voting 'aye'; those opposed by voting 'no'. Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take On this question, there are 82 voting 'yes', the record. 30 voting 'no', 1 voting 'present'. House Bill 1747. having received the required Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 365, Representative Homer. Is Mr. Homer in the chamber? Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk McLennand: "House Bill 365, a Bill for an Act to amend the Code of Criminal Procedure of 1963. Third Reading of this Bill."
- Speaker Steczo: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Fulton, Representative Homer."
- Homer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Bill was...referred to us by a member of the bench of Cook County, Judge Lacallow. It would modify the automatic revocation of bail provisions for a defendant who commits white offense of felony possession of cannabis or controlled substance while on bail to require that the automatic revocation not apply until after preliminary hearing or indictment. It's somewhat of a technical Bill, and I would try to answer

- 51st Legislative Day April 28, 1993

 questions; and, in the absence of that, I would move to
 pass the Bill."
- Speaker Steczo: "The Gentleman has moved for the passage of House Bill 365. On that question, is there any discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All those in favor will signify by voting 'aye'; those opposed by voting 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Chair recognizes the Lady from Cook, Representative Davis."
- Davis: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I just wanted to announce that according to Governor Edgar and Mayor Daley, today is Michael Jordans' Restaurant Day. I thought we might want to know that."
- Speaker Steczo: "Always good to know. The Gentleman from Vermilion, Representative Black."
- Black: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have an inquiry of the Chair.

 Have you completed this roll call and announced the record?"
- Speaker Steczo: "We will shortly do that. Were you seeking to discuss this Bill?"
- Black: "No."
- Speaker Steczo: "Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 101 'ayes', 8 'noes', 4 voting 'present; and House Bill 365, having received the required Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared...is hereby declared passed. For what purpose does the Gentleman from Vermilion seek recognition, Representative Black?"
- Black: "Yes. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. An inquiry of the Chair."
- Speaker Steczo: "Please state your inquiry."
- Black: "Are we on any particular order, right now?"

51st Legislative Day April 28, 1993

Speaker Steczo: "Not at this...we're still on the Order of House Bills."

Black: "House Bills."

Speaker Steczo: "I believe we will...I believe your inquiry is related to something other than a House Bill?"

Black: "No, just...I was just wondering where we might be on the Special Order."

Speaker Steczo: "Oh. We are on the Special Order."

Black: "What order are we on?"

Speaker Steczo: "The Order of Special Order."

Black: "The Order of Special Call. Well, okay. If the next Bill...if you could give us a general idea of where we could find it on the call, we'd...we'll follow along with you."

Speaker Steczo: "We will be happy to do that, Representative Black..."

Black: "Thank you. I wasn't sure."

Speaker Steczo: "...just as soon as..."

Black: "We'll get to Resolutions and that stuff later, right?"

Speaker Steczo: "Absolutely... Mr. Black, on page 19 of the Calendar, appears House Joint Resolution 13, Representative Dunn. House Joint Resolution 13."

Dunn: "Thank... Gentlemen of the House. This is a Resolution which calls for a study of the means by which we finance libraries. I don't think there's any opposition to this, and I would move for its adoption."

Speaker Steczo: "The Gentleman has moved for the adoption of House Joint Resolution 13. Is there any discussion? There being none, is there leave for the Attendance Roll Call? Leave is granted. House Joint Resolution 13 is adopted by use of the Attendance Roll Call. Mr. Black, the next Bill we'll hear, I believe, on the list...on the Special Order

51st Legislative Day April 28, 1993 is House Bill 1081, Representative Churchill. Mr.

Churchill. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

- Clerk McLennand: "House Bill 1081, a Bill for an Act to amend the Child Care Act of 1969. The Bill's been read a second time previously."
- Speaker Steczo: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Lake, Representative Churchill."
- Churchill: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think it needs to go to

 Third Reading if I'm not mistaken. The fiscal note has
 been filed."
- Speaker Steczo: "Mr. Churchill, I believe first you're going to have to move that the fiscal... The Bill is still on Second Reading."
- Churchill: "Right, and the fiscal note...there was a fiscal note request. The fiscal note has been filed, so I would move at this point that it should go to Third Reading."
- Speaker Steczo: "So the Gentleman...so the Gentleman would move that the fiscal note..."
- Churchill: "It's filed."
- Speaker Steczo: "You have filed a fiscal note. I'm sorry. Third Reading. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk McLennand: "House Bill 1081, a Bill for an Act to amend the Child Care Act of 1969. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Steczo: "The Gentleman from Lake, Representative Churchill."
- Churchill: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. We just had a debate on this at the Amendment stage about an about ago as Representative Phelps presented his Amendment. I don't think there's anything further that need be said at this point. I would just ask for a favorable vote."
- Speaker Steczo: "Gentleman has moved for the passage of House

51st Legislative Day

April 28, 1993

Bill 1081. On that question, is there any discussion? Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Lang."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Lang: I rise in opposition to House Bill 1081. We've debated this previously. There's an Amendment on the Bill it little better, but really doesn't accomplish what...what the...what the opponents would like to There are long, long, long list of opponents. accomplish. Church day-care centers are valuable. All day-care centers are valuable. But, we have a responsibility here to...save the lives of children and to protect children from harm. The deletion of necessary background checks in the church day-care centers flaws the Bill, in my opinion, beyond any possibility of making it right. The purpose of the background checks is to make sure that those that are taking care of our children in those day-care centers are people we can trust with those children. Whether they are church day-care centers or public day-care centers or private day-care centers is all beyond the point. The the children in point is, who is taking care of the day-care centers? I want to know that the people taking care of my children in those day-care centers are that I can trust, people of integrity, people who are not child abusers, people who are not felons, people would leave my children with in my own home for a period of The way this Bill is drafted, we do not have those predections. The way this Bill is drafted, we cannot make sure that our children are safe and protected from harm in day-care centers. Accordingly, I urge you, in the very strongest terms, to vote 'no'."

Speaker Steczo: "Is there any further discussion? The Gentleman

51st Legislative Day

April 28, 1993

from Saline, Representative Phelps."

Phelps: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Very briefly, I wasn't going to speak, but...respect I have for Representative Lang, and I know this pretty well is a philosophical difference of separation of church and state, and even then I know there are fine lines that some of us come down on those terms. But right now, churches as we know them, and organized body of believers, of whatever cause, offer a lot of resources and benefits to their members. I've attended many hundreds and thousands of potlucks where food is brought in by members. There is no public health inspection of the food. They trust their own members to serve well, and I'm sure there's been incidents of spoiled food and hospitalizations and all that. Maybe that needs to be. I don't advocate that. There are some churches that offer bible schools where toddlers and little ones are entrusted by their leaders and I...when Representative Lang alluded to the fact he doesn't want his children left in a setting. It's a parent's responsibility to check that membership out see if it's one that they would entrust their children or whoever to. We could go on about the Bill, but it's a philosophical difference of what you believe, appreciate your 'aye' vote."

Speaker Steczo: "The Chair recognizes the Lady from Cook, Representative Schakowsky."

Schakowsky: "Thank you, Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Let's be clear about what this Bill does. It exempts from licensing child care programs which are operated by churches. Now, that is not to say that if you bring your child to Sunday School may have a day-care for the day. Your child can still go to that. But it says that children will not have the same protection if they go to a day-care

51st Legislative Day

April 28, 1993

center in conjunction with the church as they do in other places. I think the most compelling argument against this Bill was made by Governor James Thompson, when he vetoed a similar Bill before. And he said, 'When a religious organization choses...chooses to enter into an arena of public service, then that service is subject to the same examination as others who venture into public service. free exercise of religion does not preclude reasonable regulation. The Illinois regulations for day-care licensing do not restrict or interfere with the teaching of religious principals and standards. The regulations only address such important issues as fire safety, staff-child ratios, qualifications of staff, adequate space, nutrition, health, and basic operational procedures. These are vital concerns when one acknowledges that children in day-care spend a of their waking hours away from their own parents.' Those are the words of Governor James Thompson. He was correct then when he vetoed similar legislation; and he's correct now when we should vote against House Bill 1081."

Speaker Steczo: "Is there any further discussion? The Chair recognizes the Lady from Cook, Representative Ronen."

Ronen: "Thank you, Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I also rise in opposition to this Bill. This Bill is not about the separation of church and state. This Bill is about the safety of children. Sunday schools and child care provided while parents attend church services or other church activities already are exempt from licensing. Also, church-based child care for child ages three and older, if a component of a religious elementary school, already are exempt from licensing. We don't have to make any further exceptions. Let me also say that the other groups... There

51st Legislative Day

April 28, 1993

is a long list of groups. I'll just mention a few that also oppose this Bill. The Chicago Association for the Education of Young Children. The City of Chicago Department of Human Services. The Child Care Association of Illinois. The Ecumenical Child Care Network. The Illinois Association for the Education of Young Children. The Illinois Catholic Illinois Maternal and Child Health Care Conference. The Coalition. The Jewish Children Bureau. The Lutheran Social Services of Illinois. The National Council of Jewish Women. United Voices for Children. Voices for Illinois Children. Just to name a few. I ask everybody to ioin together and keep children safe in Illinois, and vote 'no'."

Speaker Steczo: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from St.

Clair, Representative Flinn."

Flinn: "Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question."

Speaker Steczo: "The Gentleman has moved the previous question.

The question is, 'Shall the main question be put?'. All
those in favor will signify by saying 'aye'; those opposed
by saying 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the main question
is put. Representative Churchill to close."

Churchill: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. As this Bill came out of the committee, many people questioned it and asked that we put some additional safeguards in the Bill. And those safeguards have been placed in the Bill. We added the background checks, and we put in a provision that said that if a day-care center operated by a church was not going to do the background check that they had to give a notice to the parents coming in and ask the parents to sign that notification so they clearly understood there was not a background check. I think that that's something that's put in as a matter of

51st Legislative Day

April 28, 1993

protection for the children. We've also made the Bill...not made the Bill, but this whole concept is subject to the Department of Public Health. Also to the State Marshal, to the Life Safety Code. There are still other protections that we built in as a legislature to protect the young kids that go into these day care centers. Bill have decided that they have a long opponents of the list of people who oppose this Bill, and I believe that's true. And I think that if you look at those people who oppose it, you will see that most of them have an economic interest in keeping a day-care center alive; that they do not want the competition from day-care centers being run by churches. The people who are proponents of this Bill have a long list of people who are in favor of this Bill, and what they believe is that there should be a separation of church and state, and that the day-care centers are run by churches ask for no money. They will live within boundaries of things that keep kids safe. But in the end analysis, they don't want the State coming in and to tell them what they need to do. The key to this thing is choice. If you do not believe that the day-care centers is a place that you wish to bring your child, then do not bring your child to that center. There are thousands of people in the State of Illinois who wish to have their children in a day care operation run by a church in an unlicensed manner from...from those Departments that currently day-care centers. There are lots and lots of people that would do this willingly because they trust that the people who are running the day-care operation in churches are the highest caliber of people, and they are doing it religious purpose. I think that this is good Bill to pass at this time. I would ask for your 'aye' vote. Thank you."

51st Legislative Day

April 28, 1993

Speaker Steczo: "The Gentleman has moved for the passage of House Bill 1081. The question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?'. All those in favor will signify by voting 'aye'; those opposed by voting 'no'. The voting is open. The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from McHenry, Representative Skinner. One minute to explain your vote."

Skinner: "Mr. Speaker, back in the early '70s', there was controlled experiment that was conducted by the Illinois Economic and Fiscal Commission in which every day-care licensing official in the State of Illinois, about 42 of them, were asked to view a tape, maybe an hour long, and they were asked whether they would give this prospective day-care center a licensee...a license. One quarter of them decided to license the woman when very clearly, the...the testimony given in the tape, she should not have been licensed. Now why do all of you have this great in DCFS that has a social worker being able to make a better judgement than someone who goes to church? When it comes down to something between trusting social workers and trusting people who go to church, I'll trust the people that go to church any day."

Speaker Steczo: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 28 voting 'yes', 76 voting 'no', 7 voting 'present'. House Bill 1081, having failed to receive the required Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared lost. The next Bill shall be House Bill 2240, Representative...Erwin, back there. Mr. Clerk. Flas. Bill is on Third Reading?"

Clerk McLennand: "House Bill 2240, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Library System Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Steczo: "The Bill has now been read a third time. The

51st Legislative Day

April 28, 1993

Chair recognizes the Lady from Cook, Representative Erwin."

- Erwin: "Thank you, Speaker. House Bill 2240 is a vehicle Bill. I would appreciate your support in moving this Bill. My intention is that this be available in the Senate to amend on Secretary of State George Ryan's Live and Learn Plan. My understanding is that because this plan has just been announced this week, with the support of the four legislative leaders and the Mayor of Chicago, that the details are still being worked out, and so the Amendment was not available today. I have no other purpose for this Bill, other than Secretary of State George Ryan's plan, and to have the vehicle available. I would appreciate your support in moving this to the Senate."
- Speaker Steczo: "The Lady has moved for the passage of House Bill 2240. On that, the Gentleman from Vermilion, Representative Black."
- Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Just for the record, will the Sponsor yield? Representative, you...you have talked to Secretary Ryan today regarding this...vehicle?"
- Erwin: "I spoke with the Secretary yesterday and indicated to him that I had...this vehicle Bill, and I was ready, willing, and able to carry it. He indicated that the final decisions had not been made, but that he'd be happy to have me as a Sponsor. So, I just want it available. If, Representative Black, the decision is made by the Secretary to have another Sponsor, that's fine with me."
- Black: "Well, I appreciate your candor and...thank you very much,
 Representative. Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the
 House, as the Lady has clearly said, it's her intent to
 move this to the Senate to be used for Secretary of State
 George Ryan's Live and Learn Program. And that program is
 not yet ready to be put into Bill form, so I stand in

51st Legislative Day

April 28, 1993

support of the Representative's Motion."

- Speaker Steczo: "The question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' those in favor will signify by voting 'aye'; those opposed by voting 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, 106 voting 'yes', 6 voting 'no', 2 voting 'present'; and House Bill 2240, having received the required Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Brunsvold, are you in the chamber? Representative Dart has moved...the deadline be extended on House Bill 1550 until January 1, 1994. January 14, 1994. House Bill 1550, the deadline will be extended until January 14, 1994. Representative Black."
- Black: "Yes. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I have an inquiry of the Chair. If we're going to see very many of these Motions, I assume they're made pursuant to Rule 37 what (d)? No, that's not it."
- Speaker Steczo: "Mr. Black, I think this is the only one."
- Black: "All right. Just... If this is the only one, I certainly have no objection to this one. But subsequent extensions, we would ask that we comply with House Rule 37."
- Speaker Steczo: "All those in favor of the Motion will signify by saying 'aye'; those opposed by saying 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Motion is... Is there leave for the Attendance Roll Call? There being no objection, leave is granted, and the Motion is adopted. And the deadline for House Bill 1550 will be extended to January 14. 1384. Adjournment Resolution."
- Clerk McLennand: "House Joint Resolution 35, offered by Representative Dart. RESOLVED, BY THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE EIGHTY-EIGHTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF

51st Legislative Day

April 28, 1993

THE STATE OF ILLINOIS, THE SENATE CONCURRING HEREIN, that when the House of Representatives adjourns on Wednesday, April 28, 1993, they stand adjourned until Monday, May 3, 1993, at 12:00 o'clock noon; and when the Senate adjourns on Thursday, April 29, 1993, they stand adjourned until Monday, May 3, 1993, at 12:00 o'clock noon."

- Speaker Steczo: "Representative Currie moves for the adoption of the Adjournment Resolution. All those in favor will signify by saying 'aye'; those opposed by saying 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Resolution's adopted. Senate Bills, First Reading."
- Clerk McLennand: "Introduction and First Reading of Senate Bills.

 Senate Bill 189, offered by Representative Biggert, a Bill for an Act to amend the Personnel Record Review Act. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 294, offered by Representative Black, a Bill for an Act to amend the Jury Commission Act. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 967, offered by Representative Skinner, a Bill for an Act health care professions. First Reading of these Senate Bills."

Speaker Steczo: "Agreed Resolutions."

Clerk McLennand: "House Resolution 595, offered by Representative von Bergen Wessels. House Resolution 596, offered by Representative von Bergen Wessels. House Resolution 597, offered by Representative Rotello. House Resolution 598, offered by Representative Meyer. House Resolution 599, offered by Representative Balanoff. House Resolution 601, offered by Representative Noland House Resolution 603, offered by Representative Ryder. House Resolution 604, offered by Representative Saltsman. House Resolution 605, offered by Representative Ostenburg. House Resolution 606, offered by Representative Lawfer. House Resolution 606,

51st Legislative Day

April 28, 1993

offered by Representative Maureen Murphy. House Resolution offered by Representative DeJaegher. House Resolution 609, 610, 611, and 612, offered by Representative DeJaegher. House Resolution 613, offered by Representative Prussing. House Resolution 614, offered by Representative Weller. House Resolution 616, offered by Representative Meyer. House Resolution 623, offered by Representative House Resolution offered by Maureen Murphy. 626, Representative Parke."

- Speaker Steczo: "Representative Currie moves for the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions. All those in favor by signify...

 I'm sorry."
- Clerk McLennand: "House Joint Resolution 36, offered by Representative Tim Johnson."
- Speaker Steczo: "Representative Currie now moves for the passage...the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions. All those in favor will signify by saying 'aye'; those opposed 'no'.

 The 'ayes' have it. The...Resolutions are adopted. Mr. Clerk, General Resolutions."
- Clerk McLennand: "House Resolution... House Joint Resolution 34, offered by Representative Edley."
- Speaker Steczo: "Committee on Assignment. Mr. Clerk, will you please read the Death Resolutions. Can we have everybody's attention, please?"
- Clerk McLennand: "House Resolution 595, offered by Representative

 Currie, with respect to the memory of Howard Meyer Brown.

 House Resolution 602, offered by Representative Martinez,

 with respect to the seamory of Ceasar Chavez. House

 Resolution 620 (sic-House Resolution 621), offered by

 Representative Black."
- Speaker Steczo: "Please read the Resolution, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk McLennand: "WHEREAS, an untimely death is always

51st Legislative Day

April 28, 1993

regrettable and an event to be mourned; and WHEREAS, this House should not allow the great number of bills breathing their last this week pass without notice; and WHEREAS, when these proposals passed from this Earth, they lost their opportunity to pass from this chamber; and WHEREAS, House 561 was cut down in the prime of its short life, standing on the very edge of a fruitful life as a and WHEREAS, House Bill 313 will never know the joys of travel, not even the short trip across the rotunda to the Senate; and WHEREAS, House Bill 345 met its demise in a mugging right here on the floor of this chamber; and WHEREAS, even amendments, innocent pieces of legislation-to-be, found no protection in the House; WHEREAS, these bills may now be debated only by the angels serving in the great General Assembly in the sky, therefore be it RESOLVED BY THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE 88TH GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE STATE OF ILLINOIS, that we do hereby note with appropriate solemnity the death of these bills; and be it further RESOLVED, that, in memory to those that have passed before they had the chance to pass, we treat their cousins from the Senate with greater courtesy and more tender care; and be it further RESOLVED, that a suitable copy of this resolution be presented to every House member who had to stand by while a beloved bill breathed its last."

Speaker Steczo: "Mr. Black, would you like to move for the adoption of the Death Resolutions? The Chair recognizes Mr. Black."

Black: "I can hardly talk, Mr. Speaker, but I'll so move."

Speaker Steczo: "The very bereaved Mr. Black. I can see that.

Continue. Mr. Black moves for the adoption of the Death

Resolutions. All those in favor will signify by saying

51st Legislative Day

- April 28, 1993
- 'aye'; those opposed by saying 'no'. The 'ayes' have it.
 The Death Resolutions are adopted. Mr. Black."
- Black: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I would...I would ask that the indulgence of the Chair to have all those Members who have lost a loved one during these last hectic weeks be added as Co-Sponsor to House Resolution 620 (sic-621). And there are many on both sides of the aisle, and if they would like to join me in that Death Resolution for these good Bills, I'd certainly accept their names to be added as Co-Sponsors on that Resolution 620 (sic-621). Thank you, Mr. Speaker."
- Speaker Steczo: "Mr. Black asks leave that all Members of the House have their names added as Co-Sponsors to this Resolution. There being no objection, leave is granted. Mr. Skinner."
- Skinner: "I just wanted to make sure my name appeared right after his."
- Speaker Steczo: "Mr. Skinner, mine right after yours.

 Representative Currie now moves that the House stand adjourned until Monday at the hour of 12:00 noon. All those in favor will signify by saying 'aye'; those opposed by saying 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The House now stands adjourned."

RT: TIFLDAY

STATE OF ILLINOIS 88TH GENERAL ASSEMBLY HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES DAILY TRANSCRIPTION OF DEBATE INDEX

93/09/27 10:41:04

APRIL 28, 1993

HB-0028 SECOND READING	PAGE	109
HB-0028 THIRD READING	PAGE	109
HB-0056 SECOND READING	PAGE	112
HB-0056 THIRD READING	PAGE	113
HB-0324 THIRD READING	PAGE	118
HB-0365 THIRD READING	PAGE	131
HB-0529 SECOND READING	PAGE	9
HB-0704 SECOND READING	PAGE	124
HB-0704 THIRD READING	PAGE	125
HB-0805 SECOND READING	PAGE	105
HB-0805 THIRD READING	PAGE	105
H3-0848 SECOND READING	PAGE	64
HB-0848 THIRD READING	PAGE	64
HB-0917 SECOND READING	PAGE	65
HS-0917 THIRD READING	PAGE	71
HB-0950 RECALLED	PAGE	5
HB-0950 THIRD READING	PAGE	22
HG-1060 SECOND READING	PAGE	9
HB-1060 THIRD READING	PAGE	19
HB-1074 SECOND READING	PAGE	8
HB-1074 SECOND READING	PAGE	57
HB-1081 SECOND READING	PAGE	134
HB-1081 HELD ON SECOND		
HB-1081 THIRD READING	PAGE	63
	PAGE	134
HB-1188 SECOND READING	PAGE	13
HB-1188 THIRD READING	PAGE	22
HB-1243 SECOND READING	PAGE	72
HB-1243 THIRD READING	PAGE	77
HB-1244 SECOND READING	PAGE	78
HB-1244 THIRD READING	PAGE	82
HB-1245 SECOND READING	PAGE	80
HB-1245 THIRD READING	PAGE	81
HB-1246 SECOND READING	PAGE	82
HB-1246 THIRD READING	PAGE	86
HB-1247 SECOND READING	PAGE	86
HB-1247 THIRD READING	PAGE	99
H3-1280 THIRD READING	PAGE	128
HB-1326 SECOND READING	PAGE	100
HB-1326 THIRD READING	PAGE	100
HB-1468 SECOND READING	PAGE	14
HB-1468 THIRD READING	PAGE	25
HB-1525 SECOND READING	PAGE	101
HB-1525 THIRD READING	PAGE	101
HB-1550 MOTION	PAGE	142
H3-1551 SECOND READING	PAGE	101
HB-1551 THIRD READING	PAGE	102
HB-1635 THIRD READING	PAGE	18
HB-1693 SECOND READING HB-1693 THIRD READING	PAGE	106
	PAGE	106
HB-1721 SECOND READING	PAGE	102
Ho-1721 THIRD READING	PAGE	103
HB-1736 THIRD READING	PAGE	117
HB-1747 THIRD READING	PAGE	130
HB-1885 SECOND READING	PAGE	103
HB-1885 THIRD READING	PAGE	104
HB-2107 THIRD READING	PAGE	6
HB-2107 OUT OF RECORD	PAGE	4
HB-2203 SECOND READING	PAGE	105
HB-2203 THIRD READING	PAGE	105
HB-2207 THIRD READING	PAGE	37
HB-2240 THIRD READING	PAGE	140
HB-2269 SECOND READING	PAGE	12
HB-2269 SECOND READING	PAGE	126
HB-2269 THIRD READING	PAGE	126

ART: TIFLDAY

STATE OF ILLINOIS 88TH GENERAL ASSEMBLY HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES DAILY TRANSCRIPTION OF DEBATE INDEX

93/09/27 10:41:04

APRIL 28, 1993

HB-2269	OUT OF RECORD	PAGE	13
HB-2318	SECOND READING	PAGE	109
SB-0189	FIRST READING	PAGE	143
SB-0294	FIRST READING	PAGE	143
SB-0967	FIRST READING	PAGE	143
HJR-0013	ADOPTED	PAGE	133
HJR-0013	RESOLUTION OFFERED	PAGE	133
HJR-0035	ADOPTED	PAGE	142
HJR-0035	RESOLUTION OFFERED	PAGE	143

SUBJECT MATTER

HOUSE TO ORDER - SPEAKER CURRIE PAGE	1
PRAYER- REVEREND DON ELOE PAGE	1
PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE PAGE	1
ROLL CALL FOR ATTENDANCE PAGE	1
REPRESENTATIVE TURNER IN CHAIR PAGE	29
REPRESENTATIVE MCPIKE IN CHAIR PAGE	57
REPRESENTATIVE STECZO IN CHAIR PAGE	116
AGREED RESOLUTIONS PAGE	143
GENERAL RESOLUTIONS PAGE	144
DEATH RESOLUTIONS PAGE	144
ADJOURNMENT PAGE	146